WITNESSES to the WORD

by CHARLES C. JARRELL

Class BS480
Book .J35
Copyright No.

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

WITNESSES TO THE WORD

BY THE

REV. CHARLES C. JARRELL, A.B., B.D.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.

Book Editor Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Nashville, Tenn.
Dallas, Tex.; Richmond, Va.
Publishing House of the M. E. Church, South
Smith & Lamar, Agents
1916

BS480
.J35

COPYRIGHT, 1916
BY
SMITH & LAMAR

JUL 10 1916

©CI.A431808

$1.00

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

INTRODUCTION 1

SYNOPSIS OF THE BOOK 5

CHAPTER I.

THE WITNESS OF HISTORY; OR, THE TRIAL OF THE WORD ... 13

CHAPTER II.

THE WITNESS OF THE WORD TO ITSELF; OR, THE BIBLE FROM ITS OWN POINT OF VIEW 34

CHAPTER III.

THE WITNESS OF PROPHECY; OR, THE BIBLE AND ITS CHRIST 56

CHAPTER IV.

THE WITNESS OF JESUS TO THE BIBLE—WHAT DID HE SAY? 86

CHAPTER V.

THE WITNESS OF JESUS TO THE BIBLE (CONTINUED)—WHO WAS HE? OR, THE PERSON OF JESUS THE SUPREME CREDENTIAL OF CHRISTIANITY 108

CHAPTER VI.

THE WITNESS OF THE EMPTY TOMB 143

CHAPTER VII.

THE BIBLE THE HOPE OF THE WORLD 171

INTRODUCTION.

CHURCHES, as well as civic communities, have been judged by their literature. A Church whose doctrines and experiences are virile and with which the cause of education and general culture is a living concern will naturally and healthily express itself in a literature of pertinency. The tendency in this literature will be toward theology, apologetics, and technical discussion; but it will carry a mark and flavor suggestive of the standards and spirit of that intellectual culture which is always humanity's best expression of itself. In all past times intellectual skill has been the servitor of religion and its doctrines. Education in its highest form has always been thought of as religious and ethical. Hebrew culture—its literature, its science, and the slender but perfectly developed canons of its art—went into the mold with Hebrew religion to bring forth one result: the lively and enduring oracles of Scripture.

The medieval masterpieces are the best repositories of medieval doctrine, and the surviving religious meditations and discussions of those ages furnish some of our best models of the art of composition. All this is to emphasize the thought that the Church has a literary work to do which is not merely that of engrossing its creeds, glossing its doctrines, and recording the proceedings of its assemblies, but is also that of giving to its official and subsidiary writings a dress and savor of grace which will both attract and challenge the wider world. Theology and religious teaching in general need to be written more certainly in the terms of the

humanities and more certainly flavored with the insistency of that which we call literature. It was art in painting and architecture which preserved the forms of Christianity through an age in which its spirit was well-nigh dead. The Renaissance and the Reformation awoke together and then went hand in hand. When Methodism can put the interpretation of its old-time doctrines in the new forms of a literature that commands the living emotions and sympathies of the race, it will begin a new advance upon the world.

A new time has come, a time of opportunity for the writers and thinkers of our country. This new time is bringing larger opportunities to the writers of Methodism. From these opportunities we of the South, Church and State, are by no means excluded. The invitation to participate is rather a special and a direct one. The world, crushed by war, now looks to those strong and self-nourished peoples who have preserved themselves whole both in body and thought. Indeed, the world's literary and thought primacy is now on a journey. It will settle with those people who prepare for it a place.

That the present volume, coming from the pen of one of the younger representative men of the Church, is a distinct contribution to our denominational literature is the mature judgment of the writer of this introduction. It is a fresh, sound, and well-reasoned treatment of the fundamental element in our religion, the integrity of that revelation upon which rest our faith and all things related thereto. With equal confidence it is held that this volume is distinguished by such taste and discrimination in the use of language

and by such classic sympathies and touches as will serve to put it in the class of literature. It cannot fail to become a stimulus to a wider study of the transcendent matters which it discusses and an incentive to other of our denominational writers to cultivate the field of serious and effective authorship.

HORACE M. DU BOSE.

NASHVILLE, TENN., June 6, 1916.

SYNOPSIS OF THE BOOK.

The First Chapter.

THE first chapter seeks to trace the trial of the Word as Providence has kept it through all the emergencies of the past. The Hebrew Scriptures were preserved through the three destructions that came upon Jerusalem (1) under Nebuchadnezzar, (2) under Antiochus Epiphanes, (3) and under Titus. The same Providence kept the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures through the persecutions under the Roman emperors, then under the literary and critical attacks, as well as through the Gnostic controversies.

The contest with traditionalism in the Church did not "choke the Word" except for a season. Then deism and the "illumination" of the eighteenth century tried the Word. The collapse of the Baur criticism is then referred to and the belief expressed that the Bible will always vindicate itself as the Word of God.

The Second Chapter.

The second chapter introduces a copy of the Bible as evidence and asks what impression is made on the mind by this volume if it is allowed to speak for itself and make its own impression. The relations that exist between revelation, inspiration, and liter-

ature are studied; and it is seen that infallibility is a quality that belongs to the revelation rather than to the Book. The Church fixed the canon, but did not create the revelation. She herself was created by the revelation, and both she and it were created by the Spirit of the Master.

The Bible so studied as a whole will impress us as follows:

1. It is a unity. This unity is not factitious, but inheres in the very history itself. The book of Genesis is conscious of being the beginning; the book of Revelation is just as conscious of being its close. Two Testaments form one volume; sixty-six pamphlets make one book.

2. The Old Testament is fulfilled in the New. The outlook of the Old is toward the New. The New is conscious of having fulfilled the Old. Not only many prophecies were fulfilled, but the mission and scope of prophecy itself.

3. There is evidence of purpose in Israel's history. Only what concerns this purpose is told. Covenant follows covenant; age follows age; election grows more definite, the future goal more clearly seen—the purpose is never lost. This thread binds creation, Noachian age, patriarchal age, Mosaic age, tribal age, prophetic age, etc., all together. "Israel has the idea of teleology like a kind of soul." The whole Old Testament is provisional and preparatory for the glory and the goal yet ahead.

4. Israel's idea of God is her chief glory. He is

a God of promise and keeps his word. He is a God of character and demands character of his worshipers—*e. g.,* Micah vi. 8.

5. The Bible claims to be inspired. This claim is consistently maintained throughout. The revelation makes the history, and the history holds in trust the revelation. The historical character of this revelation must never be lost sight of.

The chapter closes with an illustration of how many stones make one building in obedience to the builder's art, because the architect is one. The Bible is stamped like bond paper with the features of its one divine Author.

The Third Chapter.

This chapter is based on the assumption that the whole Bible bears witness to Christ. The Bible, taken as a whole, presents the fact of redemption and the features of the Redeemer. This bird's-eye view of revelation is the method of Jesus, who uses it in his talk on the way to Emmaus. Thus seen, the entire Old Testament is a provisional order, a prophetic preparation for the coming King and the coming kingdom. Such prophecy as this is peculiar to Israel's religion. It is not the marvel-mongering of the pagan predictions, but a moral movement bound up always with the prospects of the kingdom of God. Such prophecy was needed to make history the medium of the revelation. The prophet was the interpreter of God's will to men. To the study of

the past he brought insight; to the future, foresight; and based both in the will of God.

The predictive element is an inseparable part of Hebrew prophecy. These predictions ran in three great lines of thought:

1. The oracles against the heathen nations: (1) Nineveh, (2) Moab and Ammon, (3) Edom, (4) Egypt, (5) Tyre, (6) Babylon.

2. The oracles against the Jewish nation. The various destructions of Jerusalem and captivity foretold; the final dispersion of the Jews foretold; the restoration from Babylon foretold and the final redemption of the race.

3. The Messianic prophecies. The Messianic hope begins in the protevangelium, runs through the covenants, the patriarchal promises, the Mosaic age, and comes to flower in the writing prophets and the Psalms. Many of these are cited. The suffering Servant and reigning King seem contradictory until both fuse in Jesus Christ. Messianic prophecy gives to the Old Testament its marvelous unity, self-consistency, and comprehensiveness, as Professor Flint remarks.

The Fourth Chapter.

The title is, "The Witness of Jesus to the Bible." It is stated that the Old Testament throws the most light on Jesus, and Jesus is the best possible authority on the matter of what the Bible is. This is shown to be, not a vicious circle, but mere fact.

It is shown that Jesus puts his imprimatur on the Old Testament, taken as a whole and in its broad divisions, and passages are cited to show that Jesus stamps it all and each general division of it as divine.

The relation of Jesus to the Old Testament is then studied, and it is seen that Jesus handles the Old Testament in a free and creative way. He says in the presence of the old law and modern duty, "I say unto you," and assumes the task of Supreme Legislator and Judge.

It is then shown that Jesus not only indorses the Old Testament by direct appeal to it and by putting his own authority back of it, but he indorses the New Testament by anticipation. He took more pains to provide for the record of revelation than to shape the outlines of his Church, and he stamps the apostolic recollection of what he said and the apostolic expositions of the gospel as inspired and divine.

It is then shown that the New Testament as we have it is this primitive apostolic body of doctrine.

The Fifth Chapter.

This chapter asserts that Christianity must have a cause and that Christ is the only adequate explanation. This is the explanation the New Testament offers. It considers the Person of Jesus as the supreme credential of Christianity. It is shown that the life that is sketched in the Gospel is different from all human lives. It is unique in the story of his birth, life, works, death, and resurrection.

His method, manner, spirit, habits of thought and speech are shown to be different. It is shown that the character consistently exhibits a more than human ideal of life, conduct, love, and sacrifice. This character is worked out and not described. The question, "Who is this character?" is answered by an appeal to the self-revelation which Jesus makes in word and deed. It is shown that the Church's attitude toward Jesus is justified by the New Testament attitude toward him and that this in turn is justified by the estimate Jesus has of himself and of his work. This is shown by an appeal to his consciousness as manifested in such crises as the baptism, temptation, calling of disciples, giving of law, forgiving sin, revealing God, teachings concerning himself, his Sonship to the Father as Son of God and himself as the Son of man, as well as his work as Redeemer of the race.

The question is then raised, "Is this character real?" It is shown that Jesus could not be a literary creation. There are four Gospels, but one Christ. Four independent forgers could never have made the one Christ; and four confederate forgers would never have left the four Gospels with their synoptic difficulties, minor discrepancies, etc. No one existed who could have created the Jesus of the Gospels without making him Jew or Greek or Roman. The Jesus of the Gospels is universal, is the Son of man.

His character is not mythical. The laws of

myths are cited, and it is shown that the Gospels are not mythological.

The Gospels are not legendary, for Luke begins to write histories and Paul to write letters in the lifetime of eyewitnesses. There is no room here for legends, even if legends could have made such literature as the New Testament.

The Sixth Chapter.

The sixth chapter is a study of the resurrection. It is shown that belief in the resurrection was the foundation of the Church and the subject of apostolic testimony. It binds together all the New Testament as the Messianic hope does the Old Testament.

Three lines of argument are followed:

1. Direct testimony. This is considered in each Gospel and in the case of Paul.

2. Indirect evidences, which are all the more important because they are unintended.

3. Circumstantial evidence, such as the existence of the Church, the change of the day of rest, and the transformation in the character of the apostles.

Naturalistic explanations do not satisfy the facts. Jesus did rise from the tomb.

The Seventh Chapter.

This chapter traces the influence of the Bible in the Roman world, in the migration of the races, in the Dark Ages, in the Middle Ages, in the Reforma-

tion period, and shows that this Book has been the hope of the world in the past. Then the modern pagan world is studied, and it is shown that only the religion of the Bible can meet the moral and spiritual needs of the race.

CHAPTER I.

The Witness of History; or, The Trial of the Word.

THE Bible is as solitary among books as Jesus is among men. Each bears witness to the other, and both together complete the revelation of redemption.

The Bible is solitary in its origins, for it grew together as no other book has ever done. It is solitary in its history; for no book has ever been read, copied, translated, persecuted, and preserved like the Bible. It is peculiar in the imperishable message that it brings, for it reflects humanity and reveals God.

The written and the incarnate Word have both had to meet the contradiction of sinners, to face a generation faithless and slow of heart to believe, and to gain ascendancy over the mind and heart of humanity by the message and life they bring. This fiery trial of our faith[1] is not peculiar to one age, nor is our generation the first to challenge the Bible to give a reason for its claim to be the inspired Word of God. This is a "tried stone," like that foundation stone laid in Zion,[2] and we need not fear that in believing this we shall ever be put to shame.[3]

---

[1] 1 Peter i. 7. [2] Isaiah xxviii. 16. [3] 1 Peter ii. 6.

Three times have these sacred rolls survived the overthrow of Jerusalem. Nebuchadnezzar left neither wall nor temple nor palace nor any of the houses of the great. The flower of the population was carried captive, and only the poor of the land were left. Antiochus Epiphanes[1] took Jerusalem and endeavored to destroy the Jewish religion. He ordered every copy of the sacred books to be destroyed and the possessor to be put to death with utmost cruelty. Titus gave the whole city to the torch and sword and took away the "name and nation" of the Jew; but through each storm of blood and fire a divine Hand kept the Word.

One can but wonder how much valuable literature must have perished forever in these disasters. The Old Testament mentions books by Jasher, Nathan, Gad, and Iddo. One must equally wonder at the Providence that preserved out of the wreck these books which are sufficient to testify of Him and to trace through history the unfolding purpose of redeeming love.

For over two centuries the Roman Empire tried to destroy the Christian and his Holy Scriptures. When found together, Book and believer both perished. The silent lips of the martyred dead preached Christ in every city. Their witness was not in vain, for the Word of the Lord grew mightily and prevailed.

---

[1]Josephus, "Antiquities," Book XII., Chapter V.

The argument of force failed utterly to arrest the growth of the Christian religion, and there were some who resorted to the force of argument. Subtle and skeptical pagans of the second century left nothing unsaid to discredit this new and dangerous competitor of the senescent paganism of the empire, and even more threatening were the internal controversies that soon arose. Before the young Church had formulated her creeds or fixed her canon or gained tolération under the government, she was plunged into one of the most dangerous controversies of all her history. The Church has seldom, if ever, passed a crisis more critical than the era of the Gnostic heresies. Earliest among them was Cerinthus, of Alexandria, contemporary and opposer of the Apostle John at Ephesus. Basilides (A.D. 130) and Valentinus (A.D. 150) were renowned Gnostic teachers and exercised great influence in their day. The name of Marcion has been dim in the memory of the Church for fifteen hundred years, but it was a name cut deep for a generation. He slashed the Gospels in pieces[1] and taught his numerous adherents that the Old Testament was the work of an inferior and immoral deity. He accepted only Paul among the apostles and only Luke among the Gospels, and this he mutilated to make it meet his philosophy. This Gnostic cult was a subtle Oriental theosophy blended with Greek philosophy, which threat-

[1]Irenæus, Cont. Haer.

ened for a time to penetrate Christianity. Had it prevailed, it "would speedily have dissipated historical Christianity into phantasies."[1] It was largely a controversy about Scripture and was one of the earliest offers of a rationalizing philosophy to patronize Christianity if it would give up its Bible. But it was by means of her historical revelation that the Church discovered the true features of her enemy and measured the dimensions of the danger she faced. It was her sacred Scriptures which showed her the one God, unfolding his purposes of redemption in a progressive revelation, where sin was seen to have its origin, not in natural necessity, but in a moral fall, and where redemption was seen to culminate, not in a phantom Christ, but in a real incarnation. These proved to be barriers too strong to be swept away.

More easily met, because from without, were the literary and critical attacks on the new religion and its historical foundations. Its books were subjected to the most searching analysis and at a time, too, when the latest surviving apostle had not been in his grave one hundred years. This second century was an intensely literary age and, to some extent, a time of religious and ethical revival. Vespasian provided for the support of lecturers throughout the cities and provinces, schools and universities flourished, and literature took on a new refinement.

---

[1]Orr's "Bible under Trial," page 6.

Thought and speech ran in the prevailing forms of rhetorical and philosophical discourse and argument.

Seneca, the elder Pliny, and Plutarch take no notice of Christianity. Tacitus, Suetonius, and the younger Pliny pass it by with small notice and a kind of fatigued contempt. Marcus Aurelius calls the early Christians the victims of a blind and unthinking enthusiasm. Lucian, in the second half of the second century, wrote his "Peregrinus Proteus," a sarcastic caricature of Christianity, burlesquing their virtues and ridiculing their faith in a "crucified sophist," as well as their hope of immortality.

The Church had small reason to fear an attack like this, however brilliant it may have been. A far more formidable antagonist was Celsus, who lived about the same time. Fisher calls him the "ablest of its assailants"; and Baur says, "He stands behind no opponent of Christianity"[1] in "acuteness, in dialectical aptitude, in many-sided culture, at once philosophical and general." This Celsus may very well be called the Voltaire of the second century. His book, "The True Word," is "a masterpiece of attack upon the evangelic record."[2] It shows the author to have been a master antagonist. It reveals a minute analysis of the Christian writings and evinces a deliberate purpose to undermine and overthrow Christianity by every resource of wit, argument,

[1] "Christian History of the First Three Centuries," Volume II., page 141. Quoted by Dr. Orr.

[2] "Bible under Trial," Dr. Orr, page 25.

and information. "The work of Celsus was written in a spirit of intense hatred and spares no thrust which criticism, calumny, and sarcasm could supply."[1] He mercilessly sifts the resurrection stories and attributes the "myth" to the hallucination of a "half-frantic woman."[2] Celsus was followed in this by Renan in his "Life of Jesus."

The book called out an elaborate refutation from the mighty Origen in his "Reply to Celsus." The book itself has perished and would probably have been forgotten but for the extracts preserved in Origen's great defense. "So far as we can see, it had not the slightest effect in stopping the triumphant progress of Christianity in the empire."[3] Porphyry also is preserved to us only in fragments. He made it his special effort to invalidate Scripture and to disparage the apostles as compared with Christ. He was the first to utter the cry, "Back to Christ"; and long before Baur he claimed that the disagreement of Paul and Peter at Antioch invalidated the authority of both.

These subtle attempts of the Gnostic theosophy to undermine the historical foundations of the faith and the searching analysis of its documents by learned and literary pagan critics called forth from the Christian community a noble literature of apology, much of which has perished. In the second

---

[1]Sheldon, "Early Church," page 169. [2]*Ibid.*, page 171.
[3]Orr, "Bible under Trial," page 26.

century and in the Roman Empire the whole ground was gone over. Christian documents were sifted, Christian doctrines were analyzed, and Christian foundations were tested. A powerful government, a proud philosophy, and a learned array of literary talent combined the forces of persecution, ridicule, argument, and literary analysis to crush the Christian community and to discredit forever the foundations of its faith. Out of it all the Church came with a deeper consciousness of the doctrinal wealth of her message and more than ever convinced of the worth of her Scriptures as a historical revelation. With a logic born of history and led by the instincts of her inner life, she moved forward to formulate her creeds and fix her canon.

Again we are impressed with the fact that the Bible has been a tried Word in all ages. "The past is a great instructor as to the power that resides in the Bible to survive the assaults made upon it even by the most skillful adversaries."[1]

With the coming on of the Dark Ages, after the break-up of the Latin civilization, the Bible found a new foe, this time in the bosom of the Church. Such an age was favorable to the growth of tradition. At first its voice was pure and vital, and its later corruption is one of the tragedies of Christian history. It hardened with the centuries into sacerdotalism and stiffened into papal pretensions, which

---

[1] "Bible under Trial," James Orr, page 25.

soon rivaled the authority of the rarely read and dimly understood Bible, written, as it was, in the dead languages. It was portable in the hands of the living priesthood and pliant in the hands of the papacy, not slow to divine its importance as an instrument of power. It had the added advantage of being brought "up to date." It boasted of unbroken continuity. It had a living voice behind it, together with the pomp and pretensions of the papal office. The papacy guaranteed the purity of the tradition, and the tradition exalted the pretensions of the papacy. The Dark Ages were just the playground for such a game. As the tradition grew more and more away from the written Word, it began to be seen that either the word of Scripture or the word of tradition must be the supreme rule of faith. In an age when the Scriptures were little known, it was easy for the living voice of tradition, calling itself the voice of the Church, to assert and exercise supreme authority over the conscience. The written Word passed largely out of the knowledge of the Church. The very monks that possessed the manuscripts must in many cases have known little about the value of the treasures they possessed. Many a precious parchment must have met the fate which the Sinaitic manuscript barely missed when rescued by Tischendorf even so late as 1859. When the young scholar Luther first saw a copy of the Bible, it made an epoch in his life.

As the Middle Ages drew to a close and pious

scholars began to translate the Word into the vernacular of the various nations, the spirit of tradition, seeing its kingdom about to be taken away, in a voice vibrant with passion and persecution said, "No!" The Bible was not to be given into the language of the laity and was not to be read by them. The right of private interpretation of Scripture was bitterly fought, which means that the authority of the Bible was contested in the name of tradition. When the Church herself sought to muffle the Word, when the Roman cross was succeeded by Roman fagots and Rome of Cæsar was rivaled by Rome of Peter, the Bible began to be again a tried Word, as in the ages of the past. But the Reformers, aided by the printing press, multiplied copies of the Scripture faster than they could be destroyed. They succeeded at last in flinging open the gates to the knowledge of Holy Scripture, and joyfully the enfranchised Church entered on its inheritance. Again the Word came forth like silver tried in a furnace, purified seven times.

The Renaissance awakened the mind and soul of Europe, and the Reformation effected the emancipation of the human intellect. "Philosophy and science made rapid strides, and erelong the seeds of a new rationalism began to be sown in the bosom of the Church with effects disastrous to reverent faith in the Scriptures."[1] This "older rationalism" made

---

[1]Dr. Orr, "Bible under Trial," page 7.

the eighteenth century its special field and found a scholastic Protestantism ill prepared to resist.

In Germany it took the form of the "Illumination." In France Voltaire was its "very eye." Moved by a "vehement and blinding antipathy" to the Christian faith, he attacked the Scriptures with a fury confident of success. This oracle of literature, this "eye of the eighteenth century illumination," has passed with his sixty books out of the life of men; but the Bible lives on because it has a message for the world.

In England this eighteenth century rationalism took the form of a proud and all-but-triumphant deism which for a time "made Christianity almost a name of mockery in cultivated circles."[1] Joseph Butler, Bishop of Durham, says in the advertisement prefixed to his famous "Analogy": "It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons that Christianity is not so much a subject of inquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And accordingly they treat it as if in the present age this were an agreed point among all people of discernment; and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world."

Archbishop Secker says: "Christianity is now ridiculed and railed at with very little reserve and the

---

[1] "Bible under Trial," Dr. Orr, page 8.

teacher of it without any at all." "A Proposal for a National Reformation of Manners," published on the eve of the eighteenth century (1694), says: "Our light looks like the evening of the world." This exultant deism was served by wit and defended by logic. It captured literature, colored the magazines, stained the common speech, and drenched the very altars of the Church.[1] The satire of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, who reports a plan on foot to take the "nots" out of the Ten Commandments and put them in the Apostles' Creed,[2] well represents the tone of English society in this deistic century. What brought deliverance to the forces of revealed religion in that age? What explains the distance between the England of that century and the England of the nineteenth century, with Tennyson and Browning bringing the breath of the Spirit into literature, with its social and political reforms, its evangelical awakening, its missionary era, its Bible diffusion, and its home evangelization? It is useless to multiply testimonies to the fact that it was the Wesleyan Revival, a revival of Biblical preaching and of Scriptural religion, that furnished to England the forces of spiritual ascendancy.[3]

This revival gave evangelical Christianity the vic-

---

[1] "Wesley and His Century," Fitchett, page 142.

[2] *Ibid.*, page 146.

[3] Macaulay, Southey, Buckle, Leckey, Green, Birrel; quoted by Fitchett, "Wesley and His Century," page 2.

tory over unbelief more than the learned confutations of Bishop Butler, who could write the "Analogy" to prop a falling Church and forbid John Wesley to preach to the depraved miners of Kingswood. The history of unbelief shows that the spell of infidelity is broken in any age when the Bible gets a fresh grip on the hearts and consciences of men. "The owls vanish when the daylight reappears." Thus passes the imposing deism of Morgan, Bolingbroke, and Hume.

It passes, but it reappears in the critical schools of Germany. In his "Founders of Criticism" Dr. Cheyne traces the great indebtedness of the German critical movement to English deism.[1] The fruit of the one has been almost as bitter as the fruit of the other.

An instructive object lesson as to the power of the Bible to vindicate itself in the face of an imposing array of radical scholarship is presented in the history of the Tübingen school, with Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860), "a man of great learning, ability, and conscientiousness," at its head. Baur proclaimed his system as the "critical" as opposed to the "uncritical" view, and its advocates looked with scorn on all who refused to accept its conclusions. The prestige of the school was great about the middle of the last century. Attracting to

---

[1] "Founders of Criticism," pages 1, 2. Quoted by Dr. Orr in "Problems of the Old Testament."

itself "a band of able scholars, men like Schwegler, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, A. Ritschl, and Samuel Davidson, it ruled the critical world for a generation."[1] The whole Tübingen theory is based on one great assumption which is the pillar of the whole. According to this hypothesis, the early Church was torn into two parties, the Petrine and the Pauline, in deadly conflict with each other. This conflict is held to have shaped the history of the New Testament Church. This history became apparent to critical—that is, Tübingen—eyes by reading between the lines of New Testament literature. The book of Acts, for example, emanates from a late, second century source and is written to gloss over the differences between Paul and the older apostles. It is not contemporary with the events it records, is no true picture of the primitive Church, and is the product of a conciliatory "tendency" after the acute stages of the controversy had subsided. Then he begins to dig into the other literature of the New Testament for facts in support of his central thesis. He fixes first the early and authentic books and traces through them the schism which rent and almost wrecked the early Church. This primitive and genuinely apostolic literature consists of four epistles attributed to Paul — Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, and Romans—and the Apocalypse, attributed to John. Baur claimed that all the older

[1]Dr. Orr, "Bible under Trial," page 27.

apostles were against Paul, that Galatians[1] presents a primitive picture of a clash at the great Jerusalem Council, and that Acts[2] is a late attempt to gloss over the ugly scar. "The Apocalypse breathes throughout," he said, "a spirit of unmistakable hostility to Paul." So John[3] intends expressly to exclude Paul from "the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb" written in the foundations of the Holy City. The mother Church at Jerusalem, with all the older apostles and "the many thousands of Jews, all zealous of the law,"[4] is on one side; and Paul, with his Gentile converts, is on the other side of the almost fatal controversy. The conflict began in Antioch in some disputes over the circumcising of Paul's new converts.[5] It held the attention of the Jerusalem Council,[6] which failed to find a permanent settlement. At Antioch[7] there occurred the final break between Peter and Paul and their respective parties. Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, and Romans were written by Paul to defend his position, the Apocalypse of John representing the Judaistic, or Petrine, point of view. These books cover the genuine history of primitive Christianity. The other books of the New Testament represent a post-apostolic period and emanate from conciliatory tendencies. The Gospel of Matthew represents the Jew-

---

[1]Chapter ii. [2]Chapter xv. [3]Revelation xxi. 14. [4]Acts xxi. 20. [5]Acts xv. 1. [6]Acts xv. 6. [7]Galatians ii. 11.

ish standpoint as it begins to moderate. Luke and the Acts are from the Pauline point of view, "written in the interests of conciliation."[1] Mark is a neutral Gospel, based on Matthew and Luke. (The newer synoptical criticism reverses this relation.) Epistles like Ephesians and Colossians are "conciliatory." The Gospel of John, with its elevated Gnosticism and metaphysical serenity, is late (160-170).

The effect of this was to lift New Testament history clear into the second century, so that it becomes late, unreliable, and discredited with prejudicial tendencies. A similar result is attained in the Wellhausen criticism, when, as Duhm boasts, by the transference of a single source (the priestly law) into the post-exilian time, at one stroke the Mosaic period is "wiped out."

This school captivated for a time the advanced spirits in theology.[2] The simplicity and ease of the method, the splendid results it achieved, and the happy combinations it enabled one to make gave to the men who used it a sense of power and of new discoveries and rallied a brilliant band of scholars round the master. Very much the same thing is happening now in the Wellhausen school, with its great vogue and almost uncontested triumphs.

The method of Baur seemed right, and the proof

---

[1] "Place of Christ in Modern Theology," Fairbairn, pages 268-273. [2] *Ibid.*

seemed clear. The analytical power with which he sifted his sources and the imaginative genius with which he reconstructed the fabrics of history seemed nothing short of marvelous. His theory, like Wellhausen's, fascinated by "the skill with which it grouped its material in support of a central thesis and by the easy key it seemed to afford to many difficult phenomena."[1] The achievement of Baur seemed colossal and complete. The New Testament seemed utterly discredited, as far as furnishing reliable records of the Gospel history was concerned. But soon criticism began to pull down what criticism had built up. The weakness of the theory was its very completeness. Its simplicity was its snare. It had to stand together or fall together. The progress of discovery and criticism pushed the literature of the New Testament back into the first century. Paul's epistles have been given back to him almost without exception. The case of the fourth Gospel has been especially interesting and instructive. In spite of a reliable tradition, the Tübingen criticism put the fourth Gospel very late (A.D. 170). "The arrogance of these assertions," says Dr. Fairbairn, "was equal to the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed."[2] To be unwilling to use these Tübingen formulas, to refuse to believe in the discoveries that turned to gold at their touch, "was to be adjudged

---

[1]Dr. Orr's "Bible under Trial," page 28.

[2]"Place of Christ in Modern Theology," page 272.

an ignoramus or a charlatan or, worst of all, an apologist." In 1842 the long-lost book of Hyppolytus (200 A.D.), "A Refutation of All Heresies," was discovered.[1] This book made it plain that the great Gnostic Basilides (125 A.D.) had founded his system on the fourth Gospel. He quotes, as from the accredited Gospel story, the words found in our John i. 9. One fact like this from history as it really was can chase a thousand theories of history as it might have been, and two can put ten thousand to flight. And here is the second. In 1853 a complete manuscript of the heretical "Clementine Homilies," composed about the middle or latter part of the second century, was found. This manuscript contained a plain reference to the story of the man born blind.[2] Most interesting in this connection is the case of Tatian's "Diatessaron." Tradition asserted, and evidence existed, that Tatian had written a harmony of the four Gospels, called "Diatessaron." The absence of the book was held to discredit the positive tradition. The book, it was said, never existed; or if it did exist, it was not a harmony; or if it was a harmony, it was not a harmony of the four Gospels; or if it was a harmony of the four, it was not a harmony of the four Gospels as we have them now. In 1888 an Arabic translation of the "Diatessaron" itself was brought to light. It begins with the stately sentence, "In the begin-

---

[1]Dr. Orr's "Bible under Trial," page 36. [2]John ix. 1-41.

ning was the Word."[1] It was found to be a harmony of our four Gospels. Faced by the facts, the school, with its pretentious tendencies, beat a retreat. A. Ritschl broke with it in 1857 and founded later the Ritschlian School of Theology, which is represented by such scholars as W. Hermann, Julius Kaftan, and A. Harnack. Prof. W. M. Ramsay gave Baur up long ago to become a defender of Luke's title to the rank of a first-class historian. Even before the death of Baur, in 1860, "his school had in reality ceased to be."[2]

Settled results! Settled when? By whom? How long will they be settled? In 1906 (*Literaturzeitung*, July 18) Professor Schurer declares that "all the representatives of the critical view of things were at one in holding that the author of the 'we' source [in the Acts] and the author of the Acts are to be distinguished, because the latter, on account of the glaring marks of unhistoricity in his work, cannot be a companion of Paul." At this Dr. A. Harnack says: "So quickly does criticism forget and in so partisan a spirit does it stiffen in its hypothesis!"[3] He says further, in his preface, "Criticism has gone wrong, and tradition is right"; and he reminds his readers that, ten years before, he had said that "in the criticism of the sources of the oldest

---

[1] John i. 1.

[2] Fairbairn, "Place of Christ in Modern Theology," page 273.

[3] "Luke: Physician, Author of Third Gospel," etc., page 5.

Christianity we are in a movement backward to tradition." Harnack cites the English scholar, Dr. Moulton, on his side of this controversy and calls him "the best authority on New Testament Greek."[1]

The Bible has suffered nothing in the past from those who have sought to interpret or reconstruct it as a mere man-made Book or to overthrow it as an enemy of true culture. When Wellhausen brings his "antisupernatural" bias to the study of the Old Testament, and when he seeks to reconstruct the whole history around his theory of the evolution of religion in Israel and to build a whole system of dates and development on his dogma of the centralization of worship, we need not hesitate to say that the man who throws himself against this stone shall be broken, and his theories shall be ground to pieces. As for the Wellhausen hypothesis, the critics are again beginning to pull down what the critics have built up.

Do not these past experiences of the Bible convince us of its power to vindicate itself as the revealed Word of God? Do they not raise the presumption in the mind and awaken faith in the soul that it will come through the "fiery trial" of this present-day "purified seven times"? The newer sciences have furnished many weapons for modern

---

[1]"Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte," Leipzig, 1911, footnote on page 2.

skepticism, but the most distinguished scientists have almost always been men of an eminently religious tone of mind.[1] As regards the bearing of "evolution" on religion, the air is certainly clearer than it was twenty-five years ago. As regards the attack of the radical criticism on the Old Testament, it is well to note how such men as Gunkel and Winckler, in the interest of a newer radicalism, are beginning to regard the Wellhausen dogma as out of date. It is more interesting to note how such leading archæologists as Sayce, Hommel, Halèvy, and Ditlef-Nielson have broken with the Wellhausen theory, which most of them had earlier accepted.[2] "The distinguished Dr. Matheson," so says Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll in the *British Weekly* September 6, 1906, "after hearty concurrence in the processes and results of the higher criticism as expounded by Prof. W. R. Smith and in the doctrine of evolution, came in late life to disbelieve in the higher criticism and in the doctrine of evolution, at least in its extreme form."

The man to whom the Bible has become the Word of God has an assurance in himself. Samuel Wesley on his deathbed said: "The inward witness, my son, the inward witness—that is the strongest proof of Christianity." In the light of that witness he was able to say: "The Christian faith will surely

---

[1] Huxley, quoted by Spencer, "Education," page 90.

[2] "Bible under Trial," Dr. Orr, page 19.

revive in this kingdom. You shall see it, though I shall not."[1] "All flesh is as grass. . . . The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: but the word of the Lord endureth forever."[2]

---

[1]"Wesley and His Century," Fitchett, page 91.
[2]1 Peter i. 24, 25.

CHAPTER II.

The Witness of the Word to Itself; or, The Bible from Its Own Point of View.

THE Bible is the literature of revelation. It is an inspired literature, for only such could constitute a revelation. Inspiration is the manward movement of God's Spirit and the Godward movement of man's spirit, and the inspired life is the organ of the revelation. The idea of revelation is a necessary part of our religion; for unless a man believes that God will speak to him, he will not attempt to speak to God.

All the great religions have been book religions. The Hindu has his Vedas; the Parsee, his Zend-Avesta; the Buddhist, his Tripitikas; the Mohammedan, his Koran; and the Christian, his Bible. The Bible differs from all other sacred books, because its revelation is different. The Bible is the literature of that revelation of redemption in the old and new covenants of which Jesus Christ is the Redeemer.

This revelation embodies itself in literature, character, worship, or institutions and may be oral or written. When it takes shape in the written record, it is not a mere collection of men's ideas about God

nor men's best philosophy of life, but a revelation in life and history of God, who reveals through men, institutions, and events his unfolding purposes and his ultimate will.

It is the life that reveals; it is the Spirit that inspires. Always and everywhere through life and through the Spirit does the literature of revelation live again and reveal the living Word. The touch of the Spirit is the knock at the sound of which "it shall be opened," and the Master issues "from the Word, where, as in a shrine, he lives in immortal youth."[1]

It is God that speaks in the revelation, rather than the revelation speaking for God. Inspiration is as necessary to us who read as it was to those who wrote, if we are to hear the voice of God. Unless the Spirit be upon the reader and the record, the Word will not reveal. It is only half the truth to say that God has spoken in the Word. God *speaks* to him that has an ear to hear.

The Christian revelation is the history of redemption, culminating in the history of the Redeemer. The Scriptures "may be described as the mode by which God, as he is Christ, lives for the faith of the Church and before the mind of the world. They, as it were, so impersonate, immortalize, and universalize the consciousness of Christ that it can exer-

---

[1]Fairbairn, "Place of Christ," page 499.

cise everywhere and always its creative and normative functions."[1]

But the Bible is a book as well as a revelation. As a revelation it is divine; as a book it is human. The revelation bears the imprimatur of the divine hand; the book bears the signature of the human hand, "the salutation of me, Paul, with mine own hand."[2] The revelation is the product of the Spirit's inspiration; the book is the work of the "holy men of God" who received the Word in many fragments and in many fashions.

To the Bible as a revelation authority belongs, and of it infallibility can be affirmed. As a revelation it speaks the language of God; as a book it speaks the language of man's heart and mind, his love, fear, and hope, and speaks this language with a human accent and under human limitations. No angel could ever have said: "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." Only human life and human speech can reveal God to men; so he took not upon himself the nature or speech of angels. The Bible speaks a human language, though it brings a divine message. No one who compares the seventeen hundred horsemen in 2 Samuel viii. 4 with the seven thousand in 1 Chronicles xviii. 4, or the seven hundred charioteers in 2 Samuel xxiii. 8 with the three hundred

---

[1]Fairbairn, "Place of Christ," page 499.

[2]2 Thessalonians iii. 17.

slain in 1 Chronicles xi. 11, or the forty thousand stalls of 1 Kings iv. 26 with the four thousand stalls of 2 Chronicles ix. 25, etc., will fail to understand that in the received texts of the Bible there are apparently contradictions in such matters as chronologies, tribal records, and military statistics.

Matthew Henry said years ago, referring to the genealogies of Chronicles: "As to the difficulties that occur in this, 1 Chronicles viii. 1-32, and the foregoing genealogies, we need not perplex ourselves. I presume that Ezra took them as he found them in the books of the kings of Israel and Judah, according as they were given in by the several tribes, each observing what method they thought fit. Hence some ascend, others descend; some have numbers affixed, others places; some are shorter, some are longer; some agree with other records, others differ; some, it is likely, were torn, erased, and blotted, others were more legible. Those of Dan and of Reuben were entirely lost. This holy man wrote as he was moved by the Holy Ghost; but there was no necessity for the making up of the defects of these genealogies by inspiration."[1] "In such cases," says Dr. Orr, "inspiration does not create the materials of its record, but works with those it has received. In strictness, the providing and preserving of sound historical material for the sacred record is the work of Providence rather than

[1]Commentary *in loco.*

that of inspiration; and a wonderful Providence it has been! Inspiration is a free, living force which informs and molds the material thus received for the ends which God designs in his written Word."[1] Infallibility belongs to the revelation rather than to the book. The book is human, the revelation is divine; and infallibility in the revelation is not dependent on infallibility in the book. Of the book we affirm veracity, trustworthiness, uniqueness, or indestructibility. Of the revelation we affirm infallibility. This is not a distinction without a difference; for the revelation is the book plus the "inward witness," the Spirit's guidance, and the living Christ.

Infallibility in the revelation belongs to matters where infallibility becomes a necessity and where it appears in the highest degree reasonable. I mean the conveyance of God to the soul and the quickening of the soul with the life of God, making wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus, being profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.[2] As a book the Bible is the product of a canonizing process that continued in the early Church and took final shape A.D. 307 at the third Council of Carthage. But the Bible is not, therefore, the creation nor the creature of the Church, for

---

[1]"Bible under Trial," page 275. [2]2 Timothy iii. 15-17.

it is by the preaching of the Word that the Church has come into being, and by that also she renews and standardizes her life. The canonizing process did indeed constitute the book, but it simply recognized the revelation. It is not a revelation because it was canonized; it was canonized because it was recognized as a revelation. Christ created the Scriptures as he created the Church. With the aid of these Scriptures we stand in the presence of the Founder and find his vision of the sanctified society which he called his kingdom. "They have the prior existence, owe everything to the Master, and do everything for the Church."[1]

In short, as a book the Bible is the subject of textual revision (lower criticism), historical analysis (higher criticism), theological and literary interpretation, and the canonizing process of the Church. The sure and better instincts of the Church will always welcome that scholarship which trains "men to read with larger eyes the books and peoples of the past."[2] "What it does and decides may be wrong, but the wrong must be proved by other and better scholarship."[3]

The Bible should be allowed to give its own account of itself, to make its own impression. If this is done, it will be proved to be its own best witness. In our day of literary analysis and critical dissect-

---

[1] "Place of Christ in Modern Theology," page 505.

[2] Fairbairn's "Place of Christ in Modern Theology," page 504. [3] *Ibid.*

ing rooms this is necessary to keep us from losing that impression which the *Bible as a whole* has always made on the faith and mind of the Church. From such a view arise evidences of its divineness and peculiar inspiration so broad-based and deep as to furnish a firm foundation for a satisfied reason and an unshaken faith.

Taking, then, the Bible as a whole and letting it make its own impression on us, we are impressed with four or five main facts which are indelibly stamped upon it. These are like features wrought into the fiber of the Book and inseparable from it.

Let us consider:

1. The unity of the Bible. At once we are struck with the fact that this book is an organic whole. It is, as Jerome called it, a "divine library"; it is, as Paul said, composed of two covenants or testaments; it did, as Hebrew i. 1 tells us, come "in many fragments and in many fashions"; and it took more than a thousand years to complete the record. But these "many fragments," when put together, so combine, these two covenants so complete and explain each other, that the Book is seen to be an organic unity. Never before or since did some sixty-six rolls, by some forty authors, composed over a period of a thousand years or more, so constitute a single theme and so unite to form one indivisible volume. Never did a book grow like the Bible. Where is the unity in the Koran or sacred books of the great ethnic religions? There is a kind of same-

ness of subject in the Zoroastrian Scriptures, but the element of growth and historical development is lacking. The Bible grows; it grows forward and fuller, more perfect and complete; it grows into one. We see the growth, discover the purpose, and mark the progress. It begins with a grand beginning—"In the beginning God." It moves on in unfolding promises, covenants, and commandments from the same one God until it culminates in the revelation of his Son. It does not stop until it reaches the end, and when it reaches the conclusion the end is apparent. Take from it Chapters i. to iii. of Genesis, and the *terminus a quo* is gone. Take from it the last three chapters of Revelation, and you rob it of its *terminus ad quem*. The best evidence that the Bible has so grown and so demonstrated itself as the living Word is the existence of the Bible itself. "No other literature is linked into one whole like this, instinct with one spirit and purpose and with all its variety of character and origin, moving forward to an unseen yet certain goal." The most searching criticism of the Old Testament cannot shake the conviction that this book is the inspired record of a unique revelation to the world. Says Dr. Sanday: "We see these ideas linking themselves together, stretching hands, as it were, across the ages, the root principles of the Old Testament running on into the New and there attaining developments which may have been present to the Divine Mind, though they could not have been present to the

human instruments whose words went and came at its promptings."[1] The reason positively refuses to entertain the suggestion that such unity can be the accidental outcome of a history which reaches from Ur of the Chaldees to the Mamertine prison and covers two captivities, with innumerable vicissitudes of national fortune and misfortune. The Old Testament presents a record moving from age to age, yet never losing its thread and ever moving toward a glory and a goal felt from the beginning, but consciously unrealized until the end is reached. The unity in such a record cannot be artificial or accidental, but is inherent and vital.

2. The Old Testament is fulfilled in the New. How vital this unity is and how organic the growth and progress in the revelation are will be best seen by considering the fact of fulfillment, when the Old and New Testaments are placed together. The fulfillment of individual prophecies will be considered later. Take the question in its largest outlines and see how overwhelming the conviction becomes that in the New Testament we have the goal, the culmination, the fulfillment of the Old. Stand beneath the shadow of the cross, call to mind the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, and see if that great lamentation over the suffering servant of Jehovah might not be chanted as a dirge while Jesus bows his head and

---

[1] "Oracles of God," pages 118-120. Quoted by Dr. Kirkpatrick in "The Doctrine of the Prophets."

gives up the ghost. He utterly, and he alone, fulfills that great vision. He opened not his mouth; he had done no violence; he bore the sin of many; he shall divide the spoil with the strong. Meek, innocent, atoning, triumphant the Servant was to be, and the Saviour was, in his passion and resurrection.

It is not all the truth to say that many prophecies have been fulfilled. The whole mission and scope of prophecy have been fulfilled. We note the steady outlook of Israel and her hope. "The set of their faces is forward." Manifold disappointments do not dim the vision; national backslidings do not break the thread. The golden age for Israel and through Israel for the world is yet ahead. The divine purpose moves forward toward a goal. There is a distinct Old Testament consciousness of this. The kingdom and its King and the tabernacle and temple, with their priest and prophet, are provisional and prophetic "figures for the time then present" and hence temporary and incomplete.[1] "There is growth in the Old Testament from the patriarchal stage to the Mosaic and from the Mosaic to the prophetic; but it is like the plant developing from stalk to bud and from bud to flower—there is a final stage yet to come, that of the ripened fruit."[2] Says Dr. Dillmann: "This religion of the people of

---

[1]Hebrews ix. 9.

[2]Orr, "Problem of the Old Testament," page 33.

Israel everywhere points beyond itself, exhibiting itself as a work begun which lacks its final perfection, and so compels us in the nature of the case to apprehend it in relation to Christianity as that in which it is perfected."[1] The covenant of external ordinances is to become inward and spiritual. The circumcision made with hands is become the circumcision of the heart. Particular blessings to Israel are to result in blessings to the whole world. One of its earliest promises said, "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed"; and one of its latest said: "Gentiles shall come to thy light." The Old Testament is conscious of containing all this in germ and prophecy; the New Testament is conscious of having brought to the fulfillment all that lay in the bosom of the Old. The spirit of the Old Testament says that the glory of the latter house shall exceed the glory of the former. The spirit of the New Testament says: "For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth." The two Testaments are bound together in a vital unity, and the unity of both is a witness to each.

3. The evidence of purpose is in Israel's history. The unity which is manifest in the Bible is further found to inhere in the very history of Israel. The history veils and yet reveals a purpose, the purpose of Israel's God. This idea of purpose dominates

---

[1]Alttest. Theol., page 8. Quoted by Dr. Orr.

the history, is the very soul of it, and invests it with that peculiar teleological character which makes it stand alone among the histories and religions of the world. This purpose is not something *read into* the history; it is something you cannot *read out.* You cannot get it out of the history. The evidence of it is the history itself. Paul calls it the mystery "hid from all ages and generations,"[1] to be revealed in Jesus Christ. Without this dominating idea of purpose the history itself falls into worthless scraps. It teases by its fragmentariness; it is without regard to what we would like to know about nations, individuals, epochs, and events; it is not scientifically put together; it does not exist for its own sake. "Israel," says Dorner, "has the idea of teleology as a kind of soul."[2]

The facts speak for themselves, and this is said with full knowledge of the fact that the radical critics propose a reconstructed history. The Old Testament, however, does exist. This much is a fact and is so far to be considered as evidence. We are seeking to find what impression this Book makes on us and what claim it makes for itself. I believe we shall find that this impression is so firm and coherent and so consistent with the claim the Book makes for itself that it will remain unshaken by any reasonable sifting of documents or shifting of

[1]Colossians i. 26 and Ephesians iii. 3, 9.

[1]Dorner, "System of Doctrine," Volume I., page 274. Quoted by Dr. Orr.

dates. You can no more grind out of this history this divine purpose than you can separate the "water-mark" from a piece of writing paper. A rapid glance will make this plain. The story of creation is the opening chapter. It is not taken from the notebook of a scientist, but from a prophet's vision. It is enough to reveal "In the beginning God." We see a creation and not a heathen cosmogony, the one God and not a mythology. It is enough to show man, the crown of creation, made in his Maker's image. The account of man's fall is placed next, to mark the beginning of his sin. It is not speculative, but it is a practical spiritual explanation of the origin of evil. God's justice falls on man's sin, though at the very beginning "mercy rejoices against judgment." The river of iniquity sweeps on, getting broader and deeper until wickedness covers the world as waters cover the sea. The storm cloud of divine judgment breaks at last in the flood. Here, again, the ark is the emblem of mercy, and the covenant with Noah makes a new beginning, with the promises of God fairer than the rainbow arching the sky of faith. From a world again fast filling with heathen darkness God calls Abraham, "that he might seek a godly seed," through him and his seed to bless all the nations of the world. Then of Abraham's seed the line of Isaac is chosen. Then Jacob is taken and Esau left, not by accident, but by design, with a view to a future, in accordance with a purpose not fully revealed, but, neverthe-

less, present. Then Judah is designed as the royal tribe.

Notice, in the next place, how the ages unfold into one another. The patriarchal age passes by with its promises, covenants, and peculiar providences. The path may wind and cross and almost lose itself; but the purpose shines clear, the promise cannot be broken, and so this age unfolds itself into the next. Then comes the Mosaic age, with a marvelous fulfilling of the promises made to the fathers. God is known as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Israel is becoming a nation with a history and with a future. We need note only the birth of Moses, his call, the exodus, the covenants and commandments of Sinai, and the providential preservation of the people; the conquest under Joshua, the restoration under Samuel, and the founding of the kingdom. Each event is instinct with the purpose. However dark the history becomes, the vision is never lost. Israel has a consciousness of election—election to a destiny and sphere of service in the world that was to fill all the history of a golden age yet to come. This consciousness is indissolubly linked into the past. Moses and the exodus are ground into the very soul of the nation. Jehovah with his covenants, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is their God. "There is thus displayed throughout the whole of these Old Testament Scriptures a historical continuity, a firmness and coherence of texture, a steadily evolving and victorious

self-fulfilling purpose, which has nowhere, even in the remotest degree, its parallel in the history of religions."[1]

4. Let us note Israel's idea of God. The very heart of Israel's religion was its idea of God. This idea was her peculiar treasure which no other nation possessed.[2] They were conscious that they were the special recipients and custodians of this revelation. Every age and every epoch of her history have this religious horizon and this theological background. The Old Testament knows no time when Israel was not conscious of possessing this knowledge which had been revealed to her as a special mark of God's favor. Monotheism is the very stuff and substance of Israel's religious consciousness. The radical critic—who assumes that all religions grow from lower forms of animism, totemism, stone and serpent worship, etc., toward and to monotheism—has assumed the existence of a general law which is far from being probable, not to say proved. The truth is, with all its religions and with all its history, the world has never had a pure monotheism—that is, a religion built on the unity and spirituality of God —except such as have grown on the parent stock of Israel. When this same critic, having assumed the law, further states that Israel is no exception to this general law, he has added a second offense to his

---

[1]Orr, "Problem of the Old Testament," page 38.
[2]Deuteronomy iv. 32-35.

first violent hypothesis. To say that the prophets are the inventors of ethical monotheism, that they put it into the religion of Israel, and that prophetic "editors" wrote it into the history of Israel, is not only to do violence to the plain sense of the history, but it is to miss the meaning of the whole prophetic movement. It is apparent that they do not speak as innovators. They chide the people and charge them with falling below their known duty and with violating the sacred covenants of the God of their fathers and with basely returning his grace and goodness with disobedience and rebellion. Their rebukes come with a recollection and a remorse.[1] Their messages always had their roots in history, Israel's peculiar history, so full of Israel's God. Their outlook was to the future, over whose hills the dawn of Israel's hope would break; but out of the past, filled with the covenant mercy of Jehovah, they drew their motives to obedience.

This God is consistently conceived of as a God who makes promises and binds himself most solemnly to keep them. He is a God who relates himself to his people by covenants and undertakes to hold these covenants sacred through all ages—that is, he is a God who lives in the realm of character. Character is the very core of Israel's conception of God. He is the Lord, the Lord God, gracious and full of tender mercies, long-suffering, and kind.

---

[1]G. A. Smith, "Book of the Twelve," Volume I., page 98.

And by these covenants the history of redemption moves on, darkened by man's sin, but illumined by the light of redeeming love. This "is the golden thread running through history, psalm, prophecy, gospel, epistle, and binding all together."[1] Israel in her highest moods always feels that her glory is her God, and Paul voices this historic consciousness of the race when he boasts that to her were committed the oracles of God.

There is another element in Israel's God that marks her religious conceptions as unique and makes us feel that these are ideas and ideals of God and not ideas and ideals of men about God. God requires character in his worshipers. "He will by no means clear the guilty." Pagan religions have always divorced religion from morality. "Walk thou before me, and be thou perfect" is one of the earliest revelations of the Bible, and all through history the end of redemption is to make men holy. God's judgments on sin in the Old Testament may seem terrific, but they must have been deserved, and they serve to stamp the consciousness of the race with a sense of God's anger at sin. While paganism sets the priest to teach religion and the philosopher to teach morality as in ancient Rome, it is the peculiar achievement of the religion of the Bible that it has welded into one religion and morality and has given to the world the character type of piety. The

---

[1]Orr's "Problem of the Old Testament," page 42.

most perfect statement of what this character religion of the Bible involves is found in Micah's classic passage:[1] "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Such a religion, we may be sure, never emanated "from man's own devising. It is too high for him. He could not have translated it into fact and history as is done in the Scriptures."[2]

5. The Bible claims to be inspired. Clear and characteristic throughout is the Bible's claim to be the inspired Word of God. This claim meets us everywhere in both Testaments and is nothing short of a national consciousness. This is a fact, and a fact, we claim, peculiar to Israel's history. Other nations have had, it is true, their mythologies, legends, myths, appearances of the gods, etc.; but in none of them do we find such history-making revelations and such revelation-yielding history. The Bible certainly claims to be a revelation of God which is essentially true and divine—a revelation which has been afforded no other people and which constitutes their peculiar trust and treasure, a treasure held in trust for all the race and until Jehovah shall set up his universal kingdom of righteousness, truth, justice, and love. This consciousness is never lost sight of and meets us from page to page, epoch to epoch,

---

[1]Micah vi. 8.

[2]Orr, "Problem of the Old Testament," page 44.

book to book, testament to testament, with an impressive consistency. God's acts reveal as well as his words. "He made known his ways unto Moses, his acts unto the children of Israel."[1] "So are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."[2] The peculiar quality, precious and indispensable, is that it is a historical revelation. Acts reveal more deeply, more inexhaustibly, more unchangeably, and yet more freshly than words. The tendency to resolve Bible history into myth and legend, coupled with the claim that its revelation quality would be untouched by such a process, was offered to the Church and rejected in the allegorizing movement of the early Church and in the Gnostic theories of the second century. It needs to be just as resolutely discerned and discredited now as then. We rest our claim to the inspiration of the Bible just where the Bible rests its own claim, on the peculiar character of Israel's history[3] and on the peculiar quality of Israel's revelation.[4] When we read the record, see its unity, trace its purpose, feel its lofty ideas of God and of duty, compare its ethical monotheism with the other religions of the world, and then ask for an explanation of these facts, the answer lies at hand on the very face of the revelation. Lawgiver, psalmist, prophet, evangelist, epistolarian, and revelator, all unite in saying:

---

[1]Psalm ciii. 7. [2]Isaiah lv. 8, 9. [3]Deuteronomy iv. 32-35. [4]Deuteronomy iv. 6, 7.

"Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth."

"The Bible contains in itself the fullest witness to its divine authority. If it appears that a large collection of fragmentary records, written, with few exceptions, without any designed connection, at most distant times and under the most varied circumstances, yet combine to form a definite whole, broadly separated from other books; . . . if in proportion as they are felt to be separate they are felt also to be instinct with a common spirit, then it will be readily acknowledged that, however they were united afterwards into the sacred volume, they are yet legibly stamped with the divine seal 'as inspired of God' in a sense in which no other writings are."[1]

Let us suppose that it has been decided to build at Washington a massive and magnificent building, a national monument, a memorial to the spirit of America. It has been arranged that the workmen and the quarries of every State are to furnish some portion of the material, that each piece is to be built according to specification and fully and finally prepared at the quarry for its place in the building.

---

[1]Bishop Westcott, "The Bible in the Church," page 14. Quoted by Dr. Orr in "The Problem of the Old Testament."

Vermont is to send white marble; Tennessee, pink marble; Georgia, her cloudy creole; Massachusetts, granite; Connecticut, brown stone; Ohio, gray sandstone; Michigan, red stone; and limestone from St. Louis. The stones are to be hewn into every shape known to the builders' art—some large, some small, some for the outer walls, some for interior decoration, and some for exterior pinnacle or tower. Like the temple at Jerusalem, not a stone is to be touched by mallet or chisel after it is laid down in Washington. Finally the stones are all laid down and classified according to the specifications. The building rises month by month; no stone misses its mate; no block lacks its fellow; each piece fits its place; there are just enough and not one too many. Finally the finished building stands, the wonder of the age. The walls are shapely and strong; the arches are true; each pinnacle has a perfect place in the picture; the builder's art is satisfied; the artist's eye is pleased. Such an achievement demands an explanation. Only one explanation can satisfy the facts. Back of the quarrymen, back of the foreman, back of the master builder must have been the master architect, who planned it all and gave to each workman the specifications for his work.

The Bible is such a temple of eternal truth. Its stones were quarried out of the lives of men far remote from one another and at periods covering at least a millennium of years. Every phase of human

experience has furnished some portion of the material. Every color of human emotion has been worked into the scheme; great blocks like Moses and Paul, small stones like Nahum and Habakkuk, stones as big as an age and pieces as small as the story of Ruth, stones as shapely as Isaiah and as rugged as Amos; yet every stone finds its place, fits its fellow, and suits the purpose of the Book. When the Book is finished, the temple is complete, God's temple of truth in man.[1] The conclusion is inevitable, the Builder is one and the Builder is God. Such an impression the Bible, when allowed to speak for itself, makes on an open mind and an honest heart. To a satisfied reason faith adds the choice of the heart; and "the acknowledgment of God in Christ, accepted by thy reason, solves for thee all questions in the earth and out of it."[2]

---

[1]See Dr. Torry's illustration in a small volume called "The Bible and Its Christ."

[2]Browning, "Death in the Desert."

CHAPTER III.

The Witness of Prophecy; or, The Bible and Its Christ.

THE whole Bible bears witness to Christ. The fact of redemption and the features of the Redeemer can be seen in the Old Testament no less than in the New by any one who follows the method of Jesus[1] and takes the "bird's-eye view" of revelation. From such an outlook seeing becomes believing, and such a conviction is not shaken by every wind of doctrine nor by every kaleidoscopic hypothesis of radical criticism. This consistent testimony of the Book taken as a whole gives coherency to the revelation and lifts it out of the class of merely human effects and furnishes the most inspiring and satisfactory evidence of the divinity of our Lord. The entire Old Testament is prophetic of the New. Fundamentally imbedded in it is this consciousness of being an incomplete, imperfect, and provisional order, a prophetic preparation for the future kingdom and the coming King. But this present discussion is concerned more with prophecy as such and prophecies individually considered.

The seer was succeeded by the prophet. The divining cup, the village oracle, the emotional madness, the ephod, the Urim and Thummim are not

---

[1] Luke xxiv. 27.

the implements of this order at its golden age nor the proper characteristics of prophecy as such. They served their purpose, which was local and temporary. To find that which was permanent, teleological, and peculiar to Israel's prophecy we must turn to the writing prophets — those preachers, statesmen, reformers, religious leaders, and heralds of the kingdom. So considered, prophecy will be seen to be the wonder of the ages, an inherent and consistent part of revelation itself. Pascal has said that the witness of prophecy to Christ constitutes the supreme evidence of the Christian religion. Prophecy as we find it in the Bible is a fact. It is entitled to be studied as such and to be allowed to make its own impression.

It is peculiar to the religion of Israel. Such divination and vaticination, such oracles and soothsayers, necromancers, astrologers, etc., as we find in heathen religions differ from Hebrew prophecy vastly more than they resemble it. Their oracles were rooted in love of the marvelous. They represented an attempt to pry into the future in answer to an idle curiosity or to meet an urgent necessity for personal or public guidance; they spoke when consulted; they were paid as other professionals in society were paid, and their ambiguity was notorious; they were individual and capricious; they were the subjects of no historical development; they were not rooted in morality; they were involved in no vital purpose and did not unite to form a coherent

hope, or national consciousness. This is precisely what Hebrew prophecy does. It is inseparably involved in the prospects of the kingdom of God. It clings as closely to the main issue as do the history, ritual, poetry, and legislation of the Bible. It has its roots in a moral purpose, the religious discipline of the race and the spiritual culture of the Church. Its outlook is toward that divine society on earth which becomes more and more clearly known as the kingdom of God. It is an inherent and essential part of such a revelation as the Bible affords. Like the revelation itself, the prophecies form one great and harmonious system. They are the betrothal promises of the divine Bridegroom to the Church, his future bride.

The necessity of prophecy arises from the very nature of the revelation. The revelation of redemption must be a revelation through history. "He made known his ways unto Moses, his acts unto the children of Israel." Such a revelation must, therefore, exhibit the same unity and continuity which belong to that eternal purpose of God which he purposed in Christ Jesus from the foundation of the world. For history to be the vehicle for such a revelation, it too must be seen to have unity and continuity, and so must be seen with the eagle eye of prophecy. Prophecy is God's perspective on history. History must be seen from above and in relation to its central event, the cross of Christ. The true proportions of the cross can never be under-

stood without adequate background and horizon. This history alone can furnish, and to furnish this is the true philosophy of history. It takes all of history to give the scale for such an event; and only prophecy, with its insight and foresight, its intuitions and visions, compacting and compressing the ages into its consciousness, can thus shape history into a vehicle for this revelation. Prophecy is no more an idle marvel than miracles are. They are both supernatural indeed, but they are both inseparably involved in the revelation. They transcend reason when seen simply in the light of the natural order; but they both answer the highest demands of reason when placed in the light of this higher order of the supernatural, the necessity of redeeming love to reveal itself.

The prophet was the interpreter of God's will to men,[1] the mouth of Jehovah, the preacher of righteousness,[2] the herald of the kingdom. He was an expert student of Israel's history, religion, and life. He read the past with insight; he scanned the future with foresight. He found the will of God revealed in both and enforced the divine will on men with motives drawn from each. He took his text from the law and the history, and in the history of the law he read the law of the history. Whether this was the written law of a completed Pentateuch

---

[1]Piepenbring, "Theology of the Old Testament," page 85.
[2]Kirkpatrick, "Doctrine of the Prophets," page 14.

or the "common law" of the national conscience is immaterial to this discussion. To show the guilt of sin he pointed to the past and charged the people with gross and ungrateful violation of their covenant obligation. To show the folly and consequences of sin he pointed to the punishments which the Holy One of Israel in the demands of righteousness must inevitably visit on his own chosen people.[1] But he always sees the "remnant" in the wreck. The dawn will come to those "who watch for the morning." The prophetic tradition never wavers that history will not break till it break in praises at his feet.

The prophet feels that he is laid hold of by the Spirit of God in a peculiar way. He is conscious that the product of this elevated mood in speech and vision is not his own thought or words, but God's word. He feels the word with clearness and certainty. Behind the inspired "will be" lies the eternal "must be." The word lies on him like a word which he burns to deliver.[2] The expression "the burden," "burden of the Lord," "burden of the word of the Lord," or some similar expression, is found in nearly every one of the prophets.[3] The expression "the word of the Lord came" occurs in Isaiah five times, in Jeremiah twenty-nine times, in Eze-

---

[1]Amos iii. 2. [2]Amos iii. 3-8.

[3]Isaiah xiii. 1, xv. 1, xvii. 1, xix. 1, xxi. 1, xxiii. 1, etc.; Jeremiah xxiii. 33, 36, 38, etc.; Nahum i. 1; Zechariah ix. 1; Malachi i. 1.

kiel forty-five times, in Amos twice, in Jonah once, in Haggai three times, and in Zechariah eight times.

Back of the message is the man. The heart of the man is what Kuenen calls his "surpassing piety and moral earnestness." The character of the prophet must attest the message; and the message must fit the present need, be consistent with previous revelation, and the predictions must stand the test of future fulfillment.

Prediction is as much a part of prophecy as miracles are of the gospel history. With the predictive element torn out, the fragmentary remains of such a mutilated mass would absolutely refuse to combine into anything intelligible, much less impressive. As they are, they form an edifice of thought and faith grand, imposing, and spacious, with Jesus Christ the "Head of the corner."

Prophecy concerns itself mainly with three great lines of thought: the oracles against the heathen nations, the prophecies concerning the Jews as a people or nation, and the Messianic prophecies. We will consider these in order.

I. THE ORACLES AGAINST THE HEATHEN NATIONS.

1. Of Nineveh, Nahum[1] says: "What do ye imagine against the Lord? he will make an utter end: affliction shall not rise up the second time." To this Zephaniah[2] adds: "He . . . will make Nineveh a

---

[1]Nahum i. 9. [2]Zephaniah ii. 13, 15.

desolation, and dry like a wilderness. . . . This is the rejoicing city that dwelt carelessly, that said in her heart, I am, and there is none beside me: how is she become a desolation!" It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that this prophecy was delivered in the noonday of one of the world's proudest empires and that it was so thoroughly fulfilled that the very site of the city was lost. The great discoverer Layard says: "It is indeed one of the most remarkable facts in history that the records of an empire so renowned for its power and civilization should have been literally lost and that the site of a city as eminent for its extent as for its splendor should for ages have been a matter of doubt."[1]

2. Of the Moabites and the Ammonites, Zephaniah[2] speaks: "I have heard the reproach of Moab. . . . Therefore as I live, saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Surely Moab shall be as Sodom, and the children of Ammon as Gomorrah, even the breeding of nettles, and saltpits, and a perpetual desolation." To this Jeremiah[3] adds: "Moab shall be destroyed from being a people." The doom of Philistia is told by Zephaniah:[4] "Gaza shall be forsaken, and Ashkelon a desolation: they shall drive out Ashdod at the noonday, and Ekron shall be rooted up." The student of history knows how thoroughly these predictions came to pass.

---

[1]Layard's "Discoveries at Nineveh," page vii.
[2]Zephaniah ii. 8, 9. [3]Jeremiah xlviii. 42. [4]Zephaniah ii. 4.

3. Most striking of all these Palestinian oracles is Jeremiah's picture of the seemingly inaccessible and impregnable palaces and citadels of Edom. He says:[1] "Thy terribleness hath deceived thee, and the pride of thine heart, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill. . . . Also Edom shall be a desolation. . . . As in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, . . . no man shall abide there, neither shall a son of man dwell in it." It is not strange that these passages were a puzzle to those commentators who lived before the discovery of the rock-hewn palaces in the cliffs of Petra. When at last these places were brought again to the light of history, it was as if the dead world had risen from its grave to bear witness to the truth of God's word.

4. Ezekiel[2] spoke concerning the mighty and ancient land of Egypt: "It shall be the basest of the kingdoms; neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations: for I will diminish them, that they shall no more rule over the nations." "And there be no more a prince of the land of Egypt." The whole history of Egypt for two thousand years seems but a commentary on this passage.

5. Tyre is mentioned in Ezekiel.[3] It is there foretold: "And they shall destroy the walls of Tyrus, and break down her towers: I will also scrape her

---

[1]Jeremiah xlix. 16-18. [2]Ezekiel xxix. 15.
[3]Ezekiel xxvi. 15-21.

dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock. It shall be a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea." "They shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of the water."[1] This was said of old Tyre; and it is said that Alexander built a passage to the new Tyre by scraping the ruins from the site of the old and laying her stones, timber, and dust in the midst of the water. The infidel Volney has described it as a place where the fishermen spread their nets.[2]

6. "Babylon, the glory of kingdoms," was yet in her pomp and pride when Isaiah[3] said: "It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation: neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their fold there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there." This is one of the peculiar cases where the prophecy seems like a description. The fate of Babylon could not have been told by the historian more exactly than it was foretold by the prophet. These prophecies against the nations were fulfilled. It is beside the mark to say that a fragment here and a detail there of individual prophecies were not fulfilled. Here are plain cases seen in large

---

[1]Ezekiel xxvi. 12.

[2]Hopkins's "Evidences of Christianity," page 309.

[3]Isaiah xiii. 20, 21.

outline, broadly based and incontestable. The problem is to account for them. This can be done only on the basis of the reality of prediction in Hebrew prophecy.

II. THE ORACLES CONCERNING THE JEWISH NATION.

The Jews themselves, both as a people and as a nation, were almost constantly the subject of predictive prophecy. Very fearfully has the author of Deuteronomy foretold the doom that would overtake a finally impenitent and unfaithful people. Mark how the "blessings" and the "curses" march in solemn processional before the people in one of the sublimest chapters in the Bible.[1] Note how the fate of the Jew for the last nineteen centuries was foretold in Deuteronomy xxviii. 64-66: "The Lord shall scatter thee among all people. . . . And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest: but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart,[2] and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee." He follows the cross around the world, that he may incur the curse he himself invoked: "His blood be upon us and our children." He is a timid citizen in all countries ("a trembling heart"), and in some lands to this day his life hangs in doubt before him. His permanence as a people

---

[1]Deuteronomy xxviii. 1-68. [2]Compare Leviticus xxvi. 36.

but serves to perpetuate the prophecy until the appointed time. The same prophetic utterance almost describes the doomster while predicting doom. "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth"—from over the seas the Roman came, as swift and terrible as his own emblematic eagle—"a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand"—no kindred Oriental speech—"a nation of fierce countenance"—how fierce of face and speech the Latin armies must have seemed to the beleaguered Jews as they filled the hillsides with crucified victims until room was wanting for the crosses and crosses for the bodies![1]—"which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young." In these Roman wars the aged and the young unfit for slavery were slain. Again the prophecy reads: "And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down, wherein thou trustedst, throughout all thy land."[2] Josephus tells how the Roman with his immense battering-ram beat through the walls of Jerusalem and overtopped them with his attacking towers. This siege and sack of Jerusalem by Titus is one of the bloodiest events in human history. Read what Josephus says[3] about the horrors of that siege, the famine, the slaughter,

---

[1]Josephus, "Wars of the Jews," Book V., Chapter XI.

[2]Deuteronomy xxviii. 52.

[3]Josephus, "Wars of the Jews," Book VI., Chapter III., Section 4.

and the final havoc, as well-nigh a whole nation was put to the sword, sent to the "games," or sold into slavery. In the light of that event read Deuteronomy xxviii. 54-57: "The tender and delicate woman among you, which would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground for delicateness and tenderness, . . . shall eat her children, and will not give to any of them of the flesh of her children, for want of all things . . . in the siege and straitness, wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in thy gates." Again, the prophecy reads: "The Lord shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships: . . . and there ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you."[1] Again, Josephus tells us that many thousands of Jews over seventeen years of age were brought to Egypt in ships to be sold as slaves[2] for the Egyptian mines. Here the sudden supply glutted the market. A Jew was bartered for a pair of slippers. At last no one would buy, and three thousand were left to starve to death.[3]

It was predicted that in this "land of beauty" "its cities shall be desolate," and "the stranger that shall come from a far land" and "all nations shall say, Wherefore hath the Lord done thus unto this land?"[4] The feet of the pilgrim and the traveler

---

[1]Deuteronomy xxviii. 68.

[2]"Wars of the Jews," Book VI., Chapter IX., Section 2.

[3]Bettex, "The Bible the Word of God," page 110.

[4]Deuteronomy xxix. 22-24.

through nearly two thousand years have been fulfilling this prophecy.

Other prophecies have more precisely named events, dates, and actors. Isaiah predicts the overthrow of Sennacherib's army and the consequent escape of Jerusalem.[1] Wellhausen calls the deliverance "a still unexplained catastrophe," but he does not dispute either the oracle or the issue.[2] Amos predicts the downfall and captivity of the Northern Kingdom. In the words of Wellhausen, he "prophesied as close at hand the downfall of the kingdom, which just at that moment was rejoicing in the consciousness of power, and the deportation of the people to a far-off land."[3] Of such a kingdom at such a time Amos predicted: "Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, saith Jehovah, whose name is the God of hosts."[4] In this epoch of illustrious splendor and in a time of peace and proud security Amos predicts the Assyrian campaign, till then unheard of.

More than a century before the captivity of Judah Micah said: "Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps. . . . Be in pain, and labor to bring forth, O daughter of Zion, like a woman in travail: for now shalt thou go forth out of the city, and thou

---

[1]Isaiah xxxvii. 26-36.

[2]"History of Israel," page 483. Quoted by Dr. Orr.

[3]"History of Israel," page 470. Quoted by Dr. Orr.

[4]Amos v. 27.

shalt dwell in the field, and thou shalt go even to Babylon." But this is not the end; for "there shalt thou be delivered; there Jehovah shall redeem thee from the hand of thine enemies."[1] Jeremiah in the last years of the kingdom of Judah predicted that the captivity now grown imminent should last for seventy years. "These nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith Jehovah, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it desolate forever."[2] This prophecy seems to have been not only substantially fulfilled, but exactly to the very year, counting from the first deportation under Jehoiakim, in 606 B.C.[3]

Isaiah xl. to lxvi. may have been written, as some think, in the exile, with Cyrus already "above the horizon"; but it was at least written before the restoration or even before Cyrus had taken Babylon[4] and is so far predictive when it says of Cyrus: "He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, 'Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid.[5] Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right

---

[1]Micah iii. 12, iv. 10. [2]Jeremiah xxv. 11, 12.

[3]Compare 2 Kings xxiv. 1; 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 6*ff*; Daniel i. 1*ff*.

[4]Kirkpatrick, "Doctrine of the Prophets," page 357.

[5]Isaiah xliv. 28, xlv. 1-4.

hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." As intimated here, the city fell by strategy; and Cyrus's general, Gobryas, caused the king's son, Bel-shar-uzur (Belshazzar) to be put to death.[1]

The book of Daniel, keenly assailed as it has been, still presents its grand visions of "the four empires" which were to precede the coming of that kingdom which was to be like the stone cut out of the mountain without hands. However some critics may strain to make the "seventy weeks" of Daniel end in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, it is only by forced and unnatural shifts that this is attempted. Reckoning from the decree of Artaxerxes and the mission of Ezra (450 B.C.), the sixty-nine weeks that were to elapse till the Anointed One (Messiah), the Prince, will run out near enough to the time of Christ's public ministry to startle any mind that is open to evidence of the reality of prediction.[2]

Even in the New Testament this people are still the subject of prophecy.[3] The fall of Jerusalem is foretold by the Saviour.[4] The apostle Paul includes Israel in the ultimate purpose of redemption.[5]

---

[1]Hastings's "Bible Dictionary"; article, "Babylonia."
[2]Daniel ix. 25.
[3]"Problem of the Old Testament," page 458.
[4]Matthew xxiv. 2-32. [5]Romans xi. 23-32.

III. PROPHECIES CONCERNING THE MESSIAH.

The Messianic hope is indelibly impressed on the Old Testament. The existence of the Messianic prophecies cannot be denied even by those who dispute the fulfillment in Jesus Christ and his gospel. The ancient Jewish writers ascribed four hundred and fifty-six passages in the Old Testament to the Messiah or to his times. They are distributed as follows: Seventy-five from the Pentateuch, two hundred and forty-three from the prophets, and one hundred and thirty-eight from the Hagiographa. These references are supported by five hundred and fifty-eight separate quotations from the rabbinic writings.[1] No one will undertake to defend these rabbinic readings, but they serve to show how continuously the Messianic light played in Israel's sky.

A most interesting fact goes to show how deep the "hope of Israel" lay on the national consciousness. The New Testament writings look on the Old Testament as being full of the Messianic expectation and freely quote it to show how it has been fulfilled in Jesus and the gospel. Each of the four Gospels and the books of Acts, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, Hebrews, and 1 Peter contain passages referred to as Messianic prophecies fulfilled in Christ. These New Testament quotations of Messianic prophecies fulfilled in Christ number in

---

[1]Edersheim's "Life of Christ," Volume II., page 710.

all seventy-four.[1] They are taken from the books of the Old Testament as follows: Genesis, seven; Deuteronomy, two; Psalms, twenty-eight; Isaiah, twenty-one; Jeremiah, one; Hosea, two; Joel, one; Amos, two; Micah, one; Habakkuk, one; Haggai, one; Zechariah, four; and Malachi, three. These seventy-four passages cover the whole range of revelation and stamp the entire Old Testament with a Messianic import. Jesus himself said: "These [the Old Testament Scriptures] are they which testify of me."

The dawn of the Messianic hope began to glow before the "Sun of righteousness" had fully arisen in the prophetic sky. The first announcement of the hope was made when the shadow of sin first fell across the pathway of the race. This has long been called the protevangelium:[2] "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." And so "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman."[3]

The seed of the woman is next shown to be Abraham's seed. In Genesis xxii. 18 the prophecy moves forward a step: "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Referring to this, Paul says: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as

---

[1]Nave's "Topical Bible," page 1010. [2]Genesis iii. 15.
[3]Galatians iv. 4.

of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."[1] "He took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham."[2] Before we leave Genesis, another step is taken: "In Isaac shall thy seed be called."[3]

Next, Jacob is "loved" and Esau "hated."[4] To Jacob's line the blessing passes. "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed."[5] In Genesis still Messiah's line is fixed in Judah, singled out of all Jacob's sons: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be."[6] "For it is evident," says the author of Hebrews, "that our Lord sprang out of Judah."[7] Judah was the royal tribe, but David's was the royal house that held the Messianic hope. "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious."[8] "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice. . . . And this is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness."[9] So Paul declares: "He was made of the seed of David according to the flesh."[10]

---

[1]Galatians iii. 16. [2]Hebrews ii. 16. [3]Genesis xxi. 12. [4]Malachi i. 2; Romans ix. 13. [5]Genesis xxviii. 13-15. [6]Genesis xlix. 10. [7]Hebrews vii. 14. [8]Isaiah xi. 10. [9]Jeremiah xxiii. 5, 6. [10]Romans i. 3.

The place of his birth is designated. Micah fixes the place of the Messiah's birth: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting."[1] To which Matthew adds: "When Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea."[2]

The time of his birth, the time of Messiah's coming, was to be before the scepter departed from Judah and while the second temple was still standing. Concerning the second temple Haggai[3] had said: "The desire of all nations shall come. . . . The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former." So confidently did the Jews believe that this temple could not be destroyed until the Messiah should come that they refused all terms from Titus and so involved themselves, city, and temple in complete destruction. Daniel also said: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy."[4] We have already seen that this time expired about the time our Lord began his public ministry—that is, was anointed at his bap-

---

[1]Micah v. 2. [2]Matthew ii. 1. [3]Haggai ii. 7, 9.
[4]Daniel ix. 24.

tism and entered into his public office as Messiah. This, of course, assumes that Daniel means by "week" a week of years and not of days.[1] It is certain that a general Messianic expectation about this time caused a number of false Christs to arise, and the expectation had penetrated even the classical peoples that an extraordinary Person was about to appear in Judea.

Elias was first to come. Messiah was to be preceded by a second Elijah. "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me."[2] "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

His birth was to be from a virgin. "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."[3]

Isaiah foresees his miracles. "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing."[4]

---

[1]Numbers xiv. 34; Ezekiel iv. 6; Leviticus xxv. 8.

[2]Malachi iii. 1, iv. 5; Isaiah xl. 3; Matthew iii. 1, 2.

[3]Isaiah vii. 14. So Matthew reads the hidden meaning of the prophet. [4]Isaiah xxxv. 5, 6.

These very miracles Christ wrought time and time again.

His public entry is thus described by Zechariah: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass."[1] The twenty-first chapter of Matthew describes the event as it took place.

His rejection by his people is foretold. "And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel."[2] "He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. . . . We hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not."[3] In the words of John: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not."[4]

He was to be scourged and mocked. "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting."[5] The scourging, the spitting, and the smiting are described in the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh chapters of Matthew.

His hands and feet were to be pierced. "The assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet. . . . I am

---

[1]Zechariah ix. 9. [2]Isaiah viii. 14. [3]Isaiah liii. 2, 3. [4]John i. 11. [5]Isaiah l. 6.

poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels."[1]

He was to be numbered with transgressors. "And he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."[2] Between the two thieves the Jesus of the New Testament was crucified.

He was to be mocked and reviled in his death. "All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him."[3] "Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and elders, said, He saved others; himself he cannot save. . . . He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God."[4]

Gall and vinegar were to be given him. "They gave me also gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink."[5] "They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall."[6]

His garments were to be parted. "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture."[7] "Then the soldiers . . . took his garments, . . . and said, Let us not rend it [the

---

[1]Psalm xxii. 14. [2]Isaiah liii. 12. [3]Psalm xxii. 7, 8. [4]Matthew xxvii. 41-43. [5]Psalm lxix. 21. [6]Matthew xxvii. 34. [7]Psalm xxii. 18.

coat], but cast lots for it, whose it shall be: that the scripture might be fulfilled."[1]

His violent death is foretold. "For he was cut off out of the land of the living."[2] "And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself."[3]

Note his pierced side. "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced."[4] "One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water."[5]

Note also his burial in a rich man's grave. "And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death."[6] "There came a rich man of Arimathæa, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus's disciple: he went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus, . . . and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock."[7]

He was not to see corruption. "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."[8] Of which Peter says: "Let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God hath

---

[1]John xix. 23, 24. [2]Isaiah liii. 8. [3]Daniel ix. 26. [4]Zechariah xii. 10. [5]John xix. 34. [6]Isaiah liii. 9. [7]Matthew xxvii. 57-60. [8]Psalm xvi. 10.

sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption."[1]

It is an interesting and profitable study to note how the Messianic Figure takes shape under the hands of successive prophets. There is a unity, progressiveness, and consistency about this Messianic hope that puts the argument far above the mere question as to whether this or that particular prophecy is Messianic or not. The unity of this hope is not the unity of the monotone. It is that high order of unity that emerges out of diverse and apparently discordant notes, combines into an ascending harmony, and so completely satisfies the higher reason.

The Messiah was to have separate offices which find their synthesis in Jesus Christ.

He was to be a Prophet like unto Moses, and the whole prophetic order was a type of him and a preparation for him. The very function of prophecy in Israel's religion finds its fulfillment in Christ. "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him."[2] According to Peter, this was expressly fulfilled in Christ.[3]

He was to be a Priest like unto Melchizedek.

---

[1]Acts ii. 29-31. [2]Deuteronomy xviii. 18. [3]Acts iii. 22.

The whole priestly order was a type of him and a preparation for him. The priestly function in Israel's religion finds its fulfillment and the reason for its very existence in him. In him alone is the permanent and absolute priesthood. "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." "Called of God a high priest after the order of Melchizedek."[1]

He was to be a King, "great David's greater Son," to sit upon his throne and order it forever. "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion."[2] The glory of his kingdom is described with marvelous spirituality in Isaiah ix. 6, 7: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it, with judgment and with righteousness from henceforth even forever." To which Micah adds: "They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."[3] "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain."[4]

---

[1]Psalm cx. 4; Hebrews v. 10. [2]Psalm ii. 6.
[3]Micah iv. 3. [4]Isaiah xi. 9.

This kingdom was to include the Gentiles. "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth."[1] "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising."[2]

If these prophecies do not unite in the Person of Jesus of Nazareth, it is perfectly useless to look anywhere in history for their fulfillment. It is hard to believe that Josephus could have been serious when he applied them to Titus. The whole New Testament revelation proceeds upon the base-line assumption that they are fulfilled perfectly, ideally, and universally in Christ.

But Christ not merely unites separate prophecies in himself; he harmonizes elements that seemed hopelessly contradictory and incompatible. Israel's religion was built on the oneness of God. He was the Holy One of Israel. This was guarded as the core of their revelation. Yet Messiah, the representative of Jehovah, is himself the "mighty God." "In such passages," says Orelli, "the Old Testament revelation falls into a self-contradiction, from which only a miracle has been able to deliver us, the incarnation of the Son of God."[3]

Likewise we find in the various prophets and Psalms conceptions of the Messiah that seem inconsistent with one another. The Messianic Figure is

---

[1]Isaiah xlix. 6. [2]Isaiah lx. 3-5.

[3]"Old Testament Prophecy," page 274. Quoted by Dr. Kirkpatrick.

at one time the commanding Prince of the fourfold Name, with his universal kingdom of truth, righteousness, and peace. At another time a somber figure fills a picture of ineffable sadness. The suffering Servant of Isaiah liii. is diverse from the Messianic King. The Messiah of Daniel,[1] cut off soon after his anointing, is in sharp contrast to the vision of the Ruler coming forth from Bethlehem,[2] standing in the majesty of Jehovah and great unto the ends of the earth.

The "smitten Shepherd" of Zechariah[3] is seemingly incompatible with the Davidic "Branch," reigning wisely and executing judgment, whose name was the Lord our Righteousness.[4] The twenty-second Psalm appears far removed from the one hundred and tenth Psalm. Such divergent elements can come together only under a higher unity. This higher unity is presented in the Person of Jesus Christ. The character of Jesus presented in the New Testament combines these apparently incompatible Messianic conceptions. They are combined, not in philosophy, but in a life—a life that has in it birth, suffering, service, death, and triumph over death. The conclusion is inevitable: either Jesus lived out a life that perfectly fulfilled, combined, and harmonized the Messianic prophecies, or he acted out in his life a Messianic rôle which he alone

---

[1]Daniel ix. 26. [2]Micah v. 2-4. [3]Zechariah xii. 10, xiii. 7. [4]Jeremiah xxiii. 5, 6.

of all men had discovered in the puzzling prophecies of the Old Testament—a rôle that began in the mystery of his birth, involved the agony of the garden, the tragedy of the cross, and the farce of a pretended resurrection. Such a statement of the case, of course, carries its own answer. But neither is it possible to believe that the gospel answer to the Old Testament prophecy is the fictitious creation of the fishermen of Galilee. The Christ of the New Testament is just as much a fact of revelation as the Messiah of the Old. Each is a perfect answer to the other. This consistency is complete, binds all the books together in the highest kind of unity, and gives coherence to the whole.

The fragmentary visions of the prophets became the perfect revelation of the Father through the Son. The long line of human priests came to completion and passed away when the perfect Priest made his soul an offering for sin. Israel's kingship passed into her Messianic King. The suffering Servant poured out his soul unto death. The good Shepherd, smitten and rejected, gathered his scattering sheep into one fold. On the eve of his ascension the risen Lord said: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." And this gospel shall be preached among all nations for a witness unto them. Then cometh the end; and there shall be a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

This is the bird's-eye view of the scripture which Jesus used to open the eyes of the disciples on the way to Emmaus. The Bible, taken as a whole and allowed to make its own impression, will take care of its own claim to be the inspired Word of God. Prof. Robert Flint remarks upon the marvelous unity, self-consistency, and comprehensiveness of the Old Testament and points out that "it is at the same time a system which is not self-contained, but one of which all the parts contribute, each in its own place, to raise, sustain, and guide faith in the coming of a mysterious and mighty Saviour, a perfect Prophet, perfect Priest, and perfect King, such as Christ alone of all men can be supposed to have been. . . . This broad, general fact, this vast and strange correlation of correspondence, cannot be in the least affected by questions of the 'higher criticism' as to the authority, time of origination, and mode of composition of the various books of the Old Testament." He says, further, that men may "altar their views as to the manner and method in which the ideal of the Messiah's person, work, and kingdom was, point by point, line by line, evolved and elaborated. There will not, however, be a single Messianic word or sentence, not a single line or feature the fewer in the Old Testament."[1]

The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. Christ is the goal of prophecy, and the goal of his-

---

[1]St. Giles Lecture. Quoted by Dr. Orr.

tory is his kingdom. The kingdom has come, but it is yet to come. The goal is still ahead. "These things were written for our learning, that we through patience and through comfort of the Scriptures might have hope."[1] "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, . . . that God may be all in all."[2]

---

[1]Romans xv. 4. [2]1 Corinthians xv. 24, 28.

CHAPTER IV.

The Witness of Jesus to the Bible—What Did He Say?

(Luke xxiv. 44.)

THE purpose of this chapter is to find what authority has been conferred on the Bible for Christians by Christ himself. It may seem to some a "vicious circle" to turn the Messianic searchlight on the cross and say, "Behold the Christ," then to claim inspiration for the Bible on the authority of "the great Teacher." It is a circle, but it is not on that account a vicious circle. It is a most profitable and a highly reasonable method of studying the case. For Christians no authority is so competent as Jesus to pass upon the Hebrew Scriptures, and no book can throw such light on the person and work of Christ as the books which were a prophetic preparation for his coming. It is quite beside the mark to say that two impeached witnesses in a court cannot establish each other's credibility. The case is widely different, as will appear. The opinion of Jesus on the Old Testament is worth more than all other voices combined, as twenty centuries of Christian history, missions, life, and worship attest. The united testimony of prophet, law, and psalm to Jesus, the preparation of the revelation for him, and

the culmination of history in him constitute a most significant witness to his work. The two receive higher corroboration from each other than they could from any other possible source; and it is the correlation, correspondence, and harmony of each with the other that lend credibility to both.

Thus "the stability and integrity of our gospel are bound up with the inspiration and divine authority of the Old Testament."[1] This is the meaning of Paul when he says we are "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."[2] He unites and holds together the apostolic and prophetic teaching, and both become strong in him. "They do not simply constitute separate parts, either of which may be removed without danger to the other. They are inseparably combined. Blot out from the New Testament the features that identify it with the Old, and little will be left that is worth contending for."[3] By its own terms the New Testament is committed to "such intimate and vital relationship to the Old Scriptures that they stand or fall together."[4]

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God,"[5] is the verdict of the New Testament on the Old. The Revised Version but serves to throw into the light the purpose for which the scripture was given.

---

[1]Bishop Wilson, "Witnesses to Christ," page 132.
[2]Ephesians ii. 20.
[3]Bishop Wilson, "Witnesses to Christ," page 133. [4]*Ibid.*
[5]2 Timothy iii. 16.

"Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work."

In line with this all the Gospels, almost every epistle, Acts, and Revelation, refer to and use the Hebrew Scriptures. "They are brought forward, not as selected and preserved specimens of the highest and best thought and literature of the nation, nor even as an element in its religious life, with a liturgical value and having the sanctity of worship attached to it, but as the authoritative standard of righteousness for the world, the divine revelation of things not seen, and only promise of hope to all men."[1]

What authority does the Bible derive from Jesus Christ? In what sense does he indorse the Old Testament and provide for the New? It is the purpose of this paper to show that Jesus Christ has set the stamp of his authority upon the entire Bible. The Scriptures are the creation of the Spirit of Christ[2] and bear his imprimatur.

It is clear from the four Gospel histories that Jesus was thoroughly familiar with the Old Testament. He "either cites or refers to passages in the Old Testament Scriptures probably more than four

---

[1]Wilson, "Witnesses to Christ," page 135.

[2]2 Peter i. 10-12.

hundred times."[1] This is all the more remarkable when it is considered that the four Gospels contain but a fragment of all he said and did. From a child he must have known the Holy Scriptures, and they were "a means of supporting and developing his inner life of trust and obedience and contributed to the formation of his life and character."[2]

It will serve our purpose here to note how Jesus meets the first great crisis of his Messianic character and career. Immediately after his baptism he went into the wilderness and suffered himself to be tested and tempted in every fiber of his humanity before entering upon his public career. The story of this temptation must have been told by himself, for neither friend nor kinsman went with him. Its insertion in the record is evidently his own thought and is done because of its revelation value for the Church. Three times does Jesus meet the tempter with the irrefragable defense: "It is written." Whether tempted to utilitarianism or spectacular presumption or political compromise, the appeal in each case must have been of the most awful and subtle character, searching the very foundations of his life and touching the basic elements of his Messianic office. In each case the appeal to scripture is irresistible to his enemy and full of comfort and strength to himself. In such a temptation, when the fundamental

[1]Bishop Ellicott, "Christus Comprobator," page 91. Quoted by Bishop Candler.

[2]Dr. Alexander, "Son of Man," page 221.

realities of life were being searched and settled, Jesus quotes three times from the book of Deuteronomy.[1] Such a use of this book in such an emergency with such results poorly fits the theory that the book itself is a pious fraud forged by zealous reformers to further the Josianic revival.

One of his earliest discourses was in his own synagogue at Nazareth. "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, . . . to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."[2]

He thus takes his text from the so-called "second Isaiah," and in the sermon which follows he alludes to the history and miracles of Elijah and Elisha as found in 1 Kings xvii. 9 and in 2 Kings v. 14.

In his Sermon on the Mount he makes frequent allusions to the teachings which had been handed

---

[1]Deuteronomy viii. 3, vi. 16, vi. 13. [2]Luke iv. 16-21.

down from "them of old time." He speaks of himself as a Revealer and Lawgiver, but he takes special pains to pass a verdict on the Hebrew Scriptures in the following words: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." The jot, or "yodh," was the smallest character in the Hebrew alphabet, and the tittle was the small horn which was written on the Hebrew consonants to prevent confusion between similar characters. The meaning is this: "Nothing truly belonging to the law, however seemingly trivial, shall drift away and be forgotten until it has done all that it was meant to do." The "till all be fulfilled" means "till all things have come to pass." "The 'all things' are the great facts of our Lord's life, death, resurrection, and the establishment of the kingdom of God. So taken, we find that the words do not assert, as at first they seem to do, the perpetual obligation even of the details of the law, but the limit up to which the obligation was to last, and they are therefore not inconsistent with the words which speak of the whole system of the law as 'decaying and waxing old and ready to vanish away' (Heb. viii. 13). The same formula is used in the Greek of Matthew xxiv. 34. The two 'untils' have each of them their significance. Each 'jot' or 'tittle' must first complete

its work; then, and not until then, will it pass away."[1]

Thus these words of the Old Bible are put very much on the same level with his own, for near the close of his own ministry he says: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."[2]

When the Sadducees sought to entangle him in the dilemma of the seven husbands,[3] he answered with a passage from the book of Exodus:[4] "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."

If we turn now to John x. 35, we find Jesus quoting from Psalm lxxxii. 6. He inserts as a parenthesis these words: "And the scripture cannot be broken." Thus he stamps the whole Old Testament with his own authority and asserts its irrefragability. More particularly does he speak in Luke xxiv. 27. Here it is said that Jesus, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." In the forty-fourth verse he says: "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me."

---

[1]Ellicott's "Bible Commentary," *in loco.*

[2]Matthew xxiv. 35. [3]Matthew xxii. 23-33. [4]Exodus iii. 6.

The Hebrew Scriptures consisted of "the law" (the first five books of the Old Testament); "the prophets" (most of the books we call prophetic and some of those we call historical); and the remaining books of the Old Testament, "the Psalms" and other sacred writings. Thus Jesus takes each one up *seriatim,* and upon each separately and upon all three together he sets the seal of his approval and the stamp of his authority.

Again, in Luke xvi. 31, he says: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." In John v. 47 we find: "If ye believe not his [Moses's] writings, how shall ye believe my words?" In Mark vii. 13, having quoted from the law of Moses, which he contrasts with the traditions of the Pharisees and scribes, he says: "You do make the word of God of none effect through your tradition." Here Jesus names the Scripture the "Word of God" and becomes authority for that expression as applied to the Bible.

It is worthy of note that in all of these four hundred allusions to the Scriptures Jesus never once quotes from nor refers to nor sounds an echo of "the Apocrypha."[1] He uses a free hand in quoting the inspired Scriptures, sometimes quoting literally and building an argument on one word and sometimes quoting freely, preserving the sense and not

---

[1]Bishop Ellicott, "Christus Comprobator," page 122.

the words. At least one quotation, so called, cannot even be identified in any known text of the Old Testament.[1] He suits his inspired material to the immediate uses he puts it to, but it never suits him to use uninspired material. As there was no Messiah in the Apocrypha, it did not serve the purposes of the Messianic kingdom, nor was it of use to the Messianic King. There is an apparent exception to this statement. In 2 Esdras i. 30 are the words: "I gathered you together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings; but now, what shall I do unto you? I will cast you out from my face." These words, of course, remind us of Matthew xxiii. 37. In 2 Esdras ii. 34-48 and vii. 28, 29 a personal Messiah is presented and once called by name. But chapters i. and ii. entire, the passage in vii. 28, 29, and other places where the name of Jesus is inserted and chapters xv. and xvi. are interpolations in the time of the Christian era, some of them as late as 268 A.D.[2]

It is, of course, impossible to notice all the quotations which Jesus makes from the Old Testament or the allusions and references to passages in it. He goes to it for personal inspiration. He appeals to it in settlement of disputed questions. He claims it in vindication of his Messiahship, and, both directly

---

[1] John vii. 38.

[2] Hastings's "Bible Dictionary," article on "2 Esdras"; and Appleton's "Universal Cyclopedia," article on "2 Esdras."

and indirectly, he indorses it as "the word of God." This universal Man breaks the bands of narrow Judaism; but his life is rooted in the Scripture, and he sees in his own personal life and teaching only the fulfillment of that which lay in the bosom of the old revelation. The old was like a seed, perfect as a seed, but provisional and prophetic. The revelation through the Son was the long-expected fruit—full, perfect, and final.

This brings us to another question: How shall we understand those passages in which Jesus asserts an authority superior to Moses as a lawgiver for the kingdom? Dr. Gross Alexander says: "While he acknowledges the divine authority of the revelation contained in the Old Testament, he was conscious of having himself a deeper and truer revelation and consequently assumed authority to amplify that earlier revelation and even to correct and abrogate parts thereof which did not accord with the deeper knowledge of truth and of God which he possessed."[1]

Let us see to what extent this is true, remembering that Jesus has absolutely and unreservedly declared the Old Testament to be—all of it and every part of it—inspired, irrefragable, and certain of fulfillment. In the Sermon on the Mount in several instances he sets himself in contrast with the law of Moses. He challenges attention with the words: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time,

---

[1]Alexander, "Son of Man," page 225.

. . . but I say unto you." Here he says "I" with startling distinctness, for the translators have well conveyed the emphasis which the Greek puts on the pronoun of the first person. He assumes the function of a lawgiver in relation to such fundamental and vital things as the Mosaic law had already passed on. Where the Mosaic law forbade murder and adultery Jesus extends the principle of the prohibition so that it includes the passions of hate and lust and so puts a cherished passion on a parity with a committed crime.

Again, he extended the Mosaic prohibition of false swearing and prohibited swearing altogether. "I say unto you, swear not at all."[1] He clearly sets up his own revelation as superior and his own authority as supreme. The law of retaliation is set aside, and in its stead is set up the startlingly different law of an all-conquering love that "beareth all things and endureth all things."[2]

A radical revision of a fundamental law is in the matter of divorce.[3] He simply repeals the Mosaic law of divorce and puts in its place his own law, which prohibits divorce altogether, save for one possible[4] exception.[5] He transcends the Hebrew law of

---

[1]Matthew v. 33, 34. [2]Matthew v. 38, 39; 1 Corinthians xiii.

[3]Deuteronomy xxiv. 1-3.

[4]See chapter on "Divorce" in Peabody's "Jesus Christ and the Social Question."

[5]In Matthew xix. 6, Mark x. 1-12, and Luke xvi. 18 Jesus is speaking of the remarriage element of divorce.

love to one's neighbor in his commands to love enemies and pray for persecutors.[1]

He exalts and clarifies the Old Testament idea of the kingdom of God, so that its ethical and spiritual characteristics may appear. The theocratic kingdom which was to come with a catastrophe becomes the kingdom of God, which is "without observation." The kingdom which was externally conceived becomes the kingdom "within you," a matter of experience. The kingdom which had for its background a glorified state becomes the kingdom whose Lawgiver is without earthly throne or authority, whose affiliations are spiritual, and whose penalties are purely providential and eternal. Again, it can hardly be denied that Jesus made an advance in the conception of God when he showed them how to feel toward God as toward a father and so turns the idea of God into the knowledge of the Godhead. He never says, "God of our fathers," nor "God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob"; but it is "my Father" when he speaks for himself and "our Father" when he teaches his disciples to pray. He seems to say to men: "If you knew my Father like I know him, then you would love and trust him as I love and trust him."

It is certain that Jesus considers the Old Testament to be the "word of God," inspired, irrefragable, certain of fulfillment, and having divine author-

[1]Matthew v. 43.

ity. It is equally certain that Jesus feels himself a lawgiver who can finally interpret, extend, amplify, clarify, or correct the old revelation to suit the needs of men. Such a free and creative handling of the old law is proper to this Person, who is himself the Son of God, the full and final revelation of the Father's will. He feels and knows as no one else can that all these changes are in harmony with the inner spirit of the Old Testament;[1] that what was germinal there becomes germinant in his hands; that what was perfect as a seed is still but the imperfect, provisional, prophetic preparation for the perfect, final fruit.

The evangelists do not seem to feel this contrast between the teaching of Jesus about the Old Testament and his free and creative handling of it. The utter absence of any attempt to smooth it over, to make their Teacher more consistent with himself, is the finest kind of evidence that they but record the facts as they actually occurred. Jesus himself neither recognizes it nor attempts to reconcile it. But Paul gives us a clue in his conception of the spiritual significance of the rite of circumcision. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has elaborated this clue into a marvelous vision of the typical and pro-

---

[1]Moses legislated for a Church enmeshed in a State; Christ for a kingdom which is "not of this world." Where Moses must seek to define and punish *crime*, Christ deals with *sin* and sin alone. So Christ gives the perfect law.

phetic value of the entire Old Testament economy. This epistle, "as an exposition of the principles of the old economy and the link of connection between that and the new, stands unrivaled and alone."[1] In the light of the New Testament we are able to read the Bible, and this is the most reasonable and scientific way to read it. It was anticipatory, preparatory, and consciously directed to coming generations. "It became broader and deeper from age to age, like the waters of Ezekiel's vision that issued out from under the threshold of the temple, giving life and hope to the nations. In their due order of succession the covenant, the law, and the prophets did their work, each carrying forward the line handed down to it by its predecessors, until the great representatives of the entire line, Moses and Elias, surrendered their prerogatives to him whose decease, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem, should bring to an end vision and prophecy, fulfill all promise, and vindicate the word heard from heaven: 'This is my beloved Son: hear him.' "[2]

The scaffolding was not to be removed till it had perfectly served its purpose. Heathen hate could not tear it down, and the waste of the years could not wear it away. When at last the time had come for ritual, temple, type, prophet, priest, and king to pass, only the hands of the divine Carpenter were

---

[1]Bishop Wilson, "Witnesses to Christ," page 159.
[2]*Ibid.*, pages 167-169.

fitted to the task of taking the scaffold down and so leave standing alone, sublime and final, God's temple of truth in man.

The Old Testament is as the voice of a forerunner crying in the wilderness of a world without revelation: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the [moral] desert a highway for our God." It was no reed of man's wisdom shaken by the wind of popular opinion. It was not clothed in soft raiment of mere earthly literature and philosophy; but, like the forerunner who summed up its voice and function, it received the indorsement of the Lord, who says to all the ages: "Search the scriptures: for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me."

Is it possible to speak of the witness of Jesus to the New Testament? Yes; by way of anticipation, preparation, and prophecy, as well as by the harmony of the New Testament writers with his inner life and purpose. Jesus took far more pains to denote and describe the written Word for the faith of the ages than he did to sketch the outlines of his Church. The Scriptures, which are but the Word made permanent, are the impersonated consciousness of Christ, "the organ by which he speaks creatively to his Church, rebukes its sins, measures its progress, judges its character and achievements."[1]

---

[1]Fairbairn's "Place of Christ," page 499.

The Church was created by the preaching of the Word.

He takes the same pains to prepare for the New Testament that he does to indorse and interpret the Old. He enshrines himself in the Word, that through the Word he may create and as the ages unfold recreate his Church and exercise everywhere and always "his creative and normative functions."

In John xiv. 26 he declares that the coming of the Comforter is chiefly for this purpose: "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you." As the incarnate Word was conceived by the Holy Ghost, so the written Word is the product of his inspiration. It was a bold prophecy for Jesus to make, but make it he did. The apostolic recollection of what he said and did and the apostolic gospel of the meaning of his life, death, and resurrection was to be, not a human, but a divine record.

"When this vast body of divine testimony had been accumulated and perfected in the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of the incarnate Son, it was committed to the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, who alone was sufficient to reveal and interpret it to men."[1]

When we say that Jesus proclaimed the inspira-

---

[1]Bishop Wilson, "Witnesses to Christ," page 216.

tion of the apostolic writings before they were written, the responsibility for that statement rests upon the Master himself. The chief purpose of the Spirit's endowment was to fit the apostles to be his witnesses; and the sum total of the apostolic witness was the Word, which lived awhile as oral, then died as the oral, that it might live forever in the written Word.

Jesus gives some hint of his reason for using this method in creating the Word in John xvi. 12, 13: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." To get the full gospel we must leave the first things of the Gospels and go on to the full and perfect unfolding of the gospel in the epistles. "Back to Christ" leads us to the feet of Him who said: "On to the apostles."

It is evident that Jesus intended to give the same indorsement to the New Testament that he gave to the Old. He bears witness to the whole Bible. There is no Christ but the Christ of the New Testament. There is no New Testament but the one which has its roots in the Old. There is no word out of the divine heart and mind healing, leading, ruling the spirit of man but this "Word of God," quick and powerful, deathless and divine, which we call the Bible.

The question has often been asked, "Is the body of literature which we call the New Testament apos-

tolic?" The Church has always believed that it is. There is no evidence that this faith has been or is about to be shaken. In the chapter on "The Trial of the Word" it was shown that the Bible has vindicated its fundamental and essential claims again and again in the face of trial. It is scarcely possible here even to sketch the argument that seeks to name the links of the chain that binds us historically to the apostolic literature. The evidences are fragmentary and often incidental; but, put together, they make the Christian tradition which stands unshaken, that the New Testament is that body of apostolic literature which Jesus provided for and which holds primitive and essential Christianity in trust for the world.

Clement of Rome, a contemporary of the apostles, appeals to the Gospels, Ephesians, 1 Corinthians, James, 1 Peter, and Hebrews. Ignatius, martyred about 107 A.D., quotes from Ephesians, Matthew, John, 1 Peter, James, Romans, Corinthians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, and 1 and 2 Timothy. Polycarp, who knew John, cites the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, seven epistles of Paul, 1 Peter, and 1 John. A later age presents such evidence as that of Papias, immediately following the age of the apostles; Justin Martyr (A.D. 140); Tatian (A.D. 172); Irenæus (A.D. 170), who speaks of every book in the New Testament but Philemon, 3 John, and Jude; Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 200), who names the four Gospels in order and quotes all the books of the

New Testament by name; and Origen (A.D. 185-253), who quotes every book in the New Testament so fully that the whole New Testament might almost be reproduced from his writings.[1] Origen was nearer to the time when the New Testament was being written than we are to the time when Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. Clement and Origen were learned and voluminous writers, who traveled extensively and studied the origins of Christianity and were nearer "the sources" than Woodrow Wilson was when he wrote the "History of the American People." By the last quarter of the second century (175-200 A.D.) we find "the four Gospels—the four we have and none else—in universal circulation and undisputed use throughout the Church, unanimously ascribed to the authors whose names they bear, circulating not only in their original tongues, but in Latin, Syriac, and other translations, freely used not only by fathers of the Church, but by pagans and heretics and by these also ascribed to the disciples of Christ as their authors."[2] The evidence is widely scattered and hence all the more convincing. "Irenæus and the 'Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons' are in Gaul; Heracleon, in Italy; Tertullian, at Carthage; Polycrates, at Ephesus; Theophilus, in Antioch; Tatian, at Rome and in Syria; Clement, at

---

[1]Bishop Candler, "Christus Auctor," pages 200, 201.

[2]Orr, "Bible under Trial," pages 175, 176.

Alexandria. The strategical positions are occupied, one might say, all over the empire. The fourfold Gospel is regarded, for the most part, as one and indivisible."[1]

The effort to break down this tradition and to discredit the literature of the early Church has itself broken down. More than a decade ago the brilliant and learned Dr. Harnack declared in his work on "Old Christian Literature" that "the results might be summed up by saying that the oldest literature of the Church in its main points and in most of its details, from the point of view of literary history, was veracious and trustworthy."[2] In his recent book on "Luke the Physician" he reaffirms this opinion even more strongly and says in the Preface, "I hope to have shown in the following pages that criticism has gone wrong and that tradition is right"; and he reminds his readers that, ten years before, he told them that "in the criticism of the sources of the oldest Christianity we are in a movement backward to tradition."[3]

Harnack breaks with the so-called settled results of criticism and champions the Lucan authorship of the third Gospel and of the Acts. Ramsay breaks with the Tübingen criticism and becomes the brilliant and versatile defender of the historical accuracy of Luke's writings. The Unitarian Dr. Drum-

---

[1]Sanday, "Fourth Gospel," page 238. Quoted by Dr. Orr.
[2]"Old Christian Literature," Preface. Quoted by Dr. Orr.
[3]"Luke the Physician," Preface. Quoted by Dr. Orr.

mond clears the air, as Dr. Sanday has said, on the Johannine problem by his work, "The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel," a convincing defense of its genuineness; and with him stand such scholars as Dr. Stanton, Dr. Sanday, and Professor Peake.

When critics of the first rank begin to criticize criticism, then indeed is the "revolution beginning to devour its own children" and the fashion to disbelieve everything which has been once believed is about to spend itself.

The most important link in all this chain is Paul, and around him the controversies of the ages have gathered. In vain have the purveyors of theological novelties sought to make him the founder of Christianity, obscuring the so-called primitive gospel of the Galilean Teacher. This conception of Paul as the obscurantist, who perverted the simple gospel of the Nazarene into a system of rigid and difficult dogma, is a misjudgment, says Deissmann in his new book on Paul.[1] "This figure," he says, "is a creation of our modern 'Paulinism'"; and he leads the way back from this Germanized, modernized Paul of the dogmas to Paul the man, the missionary, the hero of piety, who lives in Christ and knows nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified.

When this attitude is being taken toward Paul by scholars of world-wide eminence, and when Dr.

---

[1]Deissmann, "Paulus," Tübingen. 1911.

Deissmann's colleague at Berlin, Dr. Harnack, puts practically the entire body of the so-called Pauline Epistles back into his hands, we begin to see that Paul is indeed the witness that guarantees, that in the New Testament we are in touch with the sources of Christian life and doctrine. Paul knew the brother of our Lord and no doubt talked with his mother, besides holding frequent intercourse with various disciples. His conversion to the new faith and way and his lifelong devotion to the cause of his Master are evidences of the highest possible validity to the historical reality of the gospel. The complete harmony between the Christianity of the Gospel and the Christianity of the Pauline Epistles imparts a sense of unity and integrity to the whole body of New Testament literature and becomes the greatest evidence of its historical character and apostolic quality. Paul we know, and his writings we have. Through him Jesus comes in contact with the world as the historical Christ, in order that he may become to men the risen Lord and mighty Saviour. This body of apostolic literature Jesus anticipated, witnessed to its inspiration, and foretold, that it would continue in the world the activities of his own Spirit and Person. He put his imprimatur on both the Testaments. In him they come together. Each supports the other in him, and both are immeasurably strong.

CHAPTER V.

The Witness of Jesus to the Bible (Continued)—Who Was He? or, The Person of Jesus the Supreme Credential of Christianity.

WHEN we open the New Testament, we find ourselves in the presence of a glowing religious life. There is nothing in the world which offers any real parallel either to this life or to the collection of books which attests it. The soul which in contemporary literature is bound in shallows and in miseries is here raised as on a great tidal wave of spiritual blessing. Nothing that belongs to a complete religious life is wanting, neither convictions nor motives, neither penitence nor ideals, neither vocation nor the assurance of victory."[1]

But the New Testament itself must have a cause. The life that is in it must flow from a Life. Such forces can come only from a Founder, such Christianity from a Christ. It is as necessary in reason to find a reason for the existence of the New Testament as it is to find a reason for the existence of any fact whatsoever in nature or philosophy. When we ask

---

[1] Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," page 1.

for the rational cause of this fact, it is not far to seek. The religious life of the New Testament is determined by Christ. It is faith in God through him, and in this faith he is Founder and Finisher. This determines everything characteristic in Christianity. "Its convictions are convictions about him. Its hopes are hopes which he has inspired and which it is for him to fulfill. Its ideals are born of his teaching and his life. Its strength is the strength of his Spirit."[1]

It is the purpose of this chapter to hold up to view this Jesus whose portrait is presented in the four Gospels. What impression is made on us by such a study? Do the four stories blend into one life? Do we feel as we read the story that this is a real Person? Does this Person impress us as being divine, the kind of Person who would claim for himself and naturally receive the homage that Christ has held in the faith of the Church? These questions go to the heart of the problem, and it is the purpose of this chapter to give a reasonable answer to them.

I hold in my hand the four Gospels. I do not stop now to ask what Clement or Origen or Justin said about them. I lay aside the chain of external evidence that binds uncontested history to the literature of the New Testament. I am not supposed to know whether these Gospels are real histories or a collection of tales nor when they were written nor

---

[1]Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," page 1.

by whom nor why. I find the life story of Jesus written by four different writers; yet there is one Lord, one faith, one life, and such a life as declares him to be divine. This method of study lets Jesus make his own impression and, from the divine Person that moves through the pages, finds evidence that such pages are themselves precious with the light of inspiration. In such a study the figure of Jesus stands out so spiritual, so commanding, so victorious, and so real that one must exclaim with Peter, "Thou art the Christ!" and confess with Thomas, "My Lord and my God." Jesus himself is thus the supreme wonder of the Bible. He is the Keystone of the arch. Christianity is founded on the apostles and prophets, but Jesus is the Headstone of the corner. He makes his own impression of divinity; and if he fails to win the worship of the heart, all arguments to prove him divine would be an impertinence. The Bible is divine in that it gives him to the world, and he makes the case for the Bible incontestable.

The character of Jesus is absolutely unique in the annals of the human mind. To tell the story of his life is to unfold a character radically different in all essential respects from all mortals, ordinary or extraordinary, man or superman. This difference is manifest at his very birth. In words of beautiful reticence the event is foretold, and the heart is warned to await the advent of that "holy thing." The story has a more than human sweetness and

simplicity and is clothed with an air of wonder as the sacred mystery of human birth is suffused with the still higher mystery of the incarnation. How exquisitely the writers have caught the pathos of a true man's tenderness and trust and the surpassing faith of the virgin waiting for her vindication! The light that was in the face of the angel of the annunciation still shines in the words, and the music of the angel's song is in them still. This story stands as among those things most surely believed from the beginning, written down by one who diligently searched and sifted his material from those who were the eyewitnesses and the original "ministers of the word."[1] Note that this account was written in the lifetime of those who knew the Lord and his mother and his brethren; and it was written by one (Luke) who knew Paul, who himself knew the Lord's brothers and Peter. It was received without protest or challenge by the original band of believers as the primary and authentic account of the Lord's birth. Note also the moral beauty of the narrative, the reticent revealing of supernatural mysteries, its prophetic purpose, its utter and surpassing spirituality, and its consistency with the estimate Jesus has of himself and the place he holds in the faith of the New Testament Church. These considerations stamp the character of Jesus as absolutely unique in the story of his birth.

---

[1]Luke i. 1, 2.

This character was among men as a Teacher who impressed his hearers as having spoken as never man spake before. Nineteen centuries have passed; and more than ever men feel that he stands absolutely alone as a religious Teacher, Leader, and Guide. His parables were like miracles of wisdom. His miracles were like parables of power. Deissmann has said that the words and sayings of Jesus are not separate pearls threaded on one string, but flashes of one and the same diamond, the truth and its author not separable.[1]

So simple was his manner that the common people understood him and heard him gladly. He trusted himself to the plain people, to the common instincts of men, and to the native moral consciousness of the race. He dared to be the simplest teacher the world has ever known. Out of the simple things the people knew in their daily lives he built parables and illustrations to make his truth plain. He teaches without effort; and his desire is not to make the truth appear deep or strong, but simple and clear. He never takes his illustrations from the arts and sciences nor from literature, except the literature of the Old Testament. He illustrates from daily life and from nature, the home, the farm, and the street. Yet these words present ideals that are recognized as the unattained heights of spiritual glory for the race, and these simple sentences and homely stories

---

[1]Quoted by Dr. Denny in "Jesus and the Gospel."

furnish truths which are unfathomable in their depth of meaning for the moral life of men. Of learning, so called, he presents not an echo except his knowledge of the Old Testament; yet he has been the Master of the world's masters and the Teacher of the world's teachers as no other human intellect has ever been.

He is different from other teachers in that he never made a so-called system of thought or body of doctrine. Any system can be made a cross on which to crucify freedom, and any body of doctrine may be made a procrustean bed on which to break the warm and vital limbs of faith; but Jesus said: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."[1] "The greater the mere man, the more he tries to explain the universe, to find a formula large enough to contain it, to classify its facts and correlate its forces. Think of these men and the few whose names should go with them: Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Origen, Augustine, Pelagius, Athanasius, Calvin, Edwards, Leibnitz, Bacon, Humboldt, Kant, Cuvier, and perhaps some new men. Philosophers, scientists, theologians — they are all alike in this: they are building a system, a philosophy of the universe. He nowhere accounts for things. He has not a word about the 'cosmos.' In him there seems to be no consciousness of the mysteries of the universe either as to its origin or

[1] John vi. 63.

nature. He did not explain God or philosophize about God. It was John, not Jesus, who wrote of the Logos. Jesus offers no philosophy of the plan of salvation. He does not philosophize concerning faith or prayer or immortality."[1]

He is different from other teachers, again, in the sense that he speaks with a tone of peculiar authority. This caused the people to be astonished at his doctrine. Jesus does not argue; he announces. He does not seek to prove, but to explain. The solemn import of his words, "But I say unto you," is not to be missed; and it is impossible to imagine them without fatal incongruity on any lips but his own. This is what Dr. Denny calls his legislative consciousness. "There can be no greater contrast than that between the prophetic consciousness as we can discern it from the Old Testament and the consciousness of Jesus as it is revealed in the Sermon on the Mount. There is not in the Old Testament the remotest analogy to such words as, 'Ye have heard that it was said of old time, but I say unto you.' The sovereign legislative authority which breathes throughout the Sermon on the Mount stands absolutely alone in Scripture."[2] He still asserts his unrivaled right to command and confronts the world today with its perils of sin and its problems of society with those quiet words, "But I say unto you."

---

[1]Bishop Haygood, "Man of Galilee," pages 64, 65.
[2]Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," pages 244, 245.

Jesus's method of thought is native to himself and is not approached by any other thinker the world has ever had. He never seems to investigate or seek or find or discover truth. Truth seems to be native to him. It is not detached that he must seek, or distant that he must strain his eyes to see, or hidden that he must discover. He seems to know. For him to know himself is to know the truth.[1] There seem to be no processes of knowledge with Jesus, nor strain of achievement as if he were striving to know, nor intellectual heats as men feel when they find and cry, "Eureka!" The mightiest and sublimest revelations of God and insights into duty and destiny he makes as simply as if he were breathing out of himself and as if he were infinitely more than anything he had ever said. He is never "stung by the splendor of a sudden thought." He does not leap to his feet like Kepler and say, "O God, I am thinking thy thoughts after thee"; nor does the pen fall from his agitated hand as it did from Newton's when he foresaw the successful end of the calculation which established a new law of the universe. His knowledge was native, natural, and inexhaustible, because his knowledge and his life were one. The truth coalesces into the unity of the Speaker and his life.[2]

This knoweldge, he declares, is peculiar to him-

---

[1] John xiv. 6.

[2] Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," page 196.

self, and there is nothing like it except the spiritual insight he confers on men who follow him in faith.[1] No wonder they who had been sent to arrest him returned to say, "Never man spake like this man"![2]

This Jesus of the New Testament is a Person who performs innumerable works of power such as no mere man ever wrought. Each of the four Gospels is a miracle Gospel. Mark, supposed to be the earliest, was written down in a book 65-70 A.D. (Harnack), while many of the original followers of our Lord were still alive. Each of the four has also the story of the passion and resurrection. The non-Markan source (the so-called Q), which, together with Mark, is supposed to have formed the basis of Matthew and Luke, is itself a miracle source. If there was a Jesus who simply taught and exercised no miraculous powers and made no claim to such, there is of such a person and such a movement not the trace of a record left. The miracle Gospels have the whole field to themselves. We have no historical connection with a Jesus who worked no miracles. If there was such a Jesus, the true story of him perished, and the miracle Gospels were written down while eyewitnesses of the truth were still living. Men have constructed out of our Gospels a nonmiracle Gospel story, as Jefferson did; but the fact remains that the miracle Gospels were

[1]Matthew xi. 27. [2]John vii. 46.

in the field first and, historically speaking, have the whole field to themselves.

These recorded works of power, some thirty-three in number, are said to be but a few of his marvelous works, beginning with the wedding at Cana of Galilee, when he began through them to show forth his glory. A study of these selected instances will reveal a reasonable order and a moral meaning such as could not belong to a mere string of marvels. They clothe Jesus with an air of majesty and mastery—Master of the forces of nature, the diseases of the body, the maladies of the mind, and over death itself.

The English word "miracles" is not the best word to express that which is called at times "wonders," "signs," "powers," "works." We find continually in the Gospels "signs and wonders," but never "wonders" alone; and the almost exclusive use of the word "miracle" in English and "wunder" in German serves to lay the main stress on that element in the mighty work which was not the most significant. Wonderful as they are, they are signs and pledges of something beyond and above themselves. They are signs of the Master's grace and power and revealings of the higher world of order, beauty, truth, and love. This draws the sharp line between the gracious works of Christ and the mere marvels which abound in the uncanonical Gospels and in heathen literature.

In the Gospels the word, the work, and the work-

er are so related that neither stands alone, and each bears witness to the other two. They cannot be torn apart without doing violence to the portrait of Jesus as we find it. He expresses himself as naturally and as easily through the works of power as through the parable or sermon. They both inhere in him and seem native to him. They are characteristic of him, and both alike bear the stamp of his personality. They express his purpose and reveal his spirit. They are redemptive acts and words because he is the Redeemer. The miracle fits his hand as easily as the parable becomes his speech, and both serve to reveal the majesty of his love and life. Such works are not to be compared to "mere freaks and plays of power, done as in wantonness and for their own sakes, with no need compelling, for show and ostentation." The moral deeps and the spiritual beauties of Jesus's miracles appear most clearly when seen against the dark background of heathen magic. Think of the so-called miracles of Simon Magus, whose dogs of brass and stone were made to bark, his statues to talk; who made himself to fly through the air, to appear now a serpent, now a goat, now with one face, now with two, to roll unhurt on burning coals, etc.[1] Not only are such things lacking in the Gospel narratives, but Jesus is shown to have set all this aside as one of the radical temptations of his life. False Christs will seek to establish their

[1] Trench on "Miracles," page 31.

claims with mere marvels, "great wonders";[1] but not so with Jesus. His miracles are ethical acts and have relations to his Person and to the needs of men. They move in the sphere of redemption and serve purposes of revelation. The doctrine tries the miracle, and the miracle seals the doctrine; and both manifest forth his glory, and his disciples believe on him.

But the full proportions of this figure will never be appreciated until it is studied from within. This character, whether real or imaginary, whether human or divine, reveals himself in a series of self-revelations. We will confine attention to those parts of the record which are oldest and least liable to critical objection.

1. In his baptism Jesus begins to reveal the consciousness that he was to live a life and do a work that cannot be classed as human. This account of the baptism belongs to the earliest materials of the Gospel narrative and has been preserved for us in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. That Jesus attaches a deep significance to this experience is manifest; and the Gospel writers preserve it as fact, though it affords some embarrassment to their faith.[2] Mark's account is as follows: "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in the Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heav-

[1]Mark xiii. 22. [2]Matthew iii. 14*f*.

ens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him: and a voice came out of the heavens, Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."[1]

Jesus looks on this as the beginning of his life work. All has been held in check up to this moment. No miracles are wrought in childhood, though the puerile miracles of the infancy are the disgrace of the apocryphal Gospels. Now the time has come. The Spirit descends, and from this time on Jesus manifests a native and simple consciousness that a divine power through that descent and from that hour has entered into his life. The heavenly voice, whether objective or subjective, whether a spiritual or a physical phenomenon, uses the words of the Old Testament. "The first clause, 'Thou art my Son,' comes from the second Psalm, where it is addressed by God to the ideal King of Israel. The second clause, 'the beloved, in whom I am well pleased,' goes in the same way to Isaiah xlii. and recalls the servant of the Lord on whom God puts his Spirit."[2] These visions and voices give us an insight into the inner life of Jesus and reveal his consciousness of himself as entering upon a unique and, indeed, divine vocation and having a divine equipment for it. This consciousness of himself thus early manifest is consistently effective throughout his whole life. He is never once false

---

[1]Mark i. 9-11. [2]Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," page 203.

to it, and never once does it appear in any other way than native, simple, easy, the base line and "vindication of his whole attitude to men and of the attitude of his followers to him."[1]

2. Mark relates the story of the temptation in barest outlines. "And immediately the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness. And he was there in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan; and was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him."[2] Matthew and Luke give the story in a framework of poetic symbolism. The story must, of course, come from the Saviour himself; and he doubtless referred to it at times in terms of extreme brevity, as in Mark, and at other times with a fuller unfolding of its issues and experiences. Jesus was tempted in all points like as we are, but no man was ever tempted as he was at this time. He is keenly conscious that this is a unique experience, that it marked the threshold of his public career and completed his fitness and equipment for his life work. He has been declared by the voice to be God's Son and has felt the descent of the dove bringing the consciousness of divine power. The first of these temptations involved the exercise of that power; and the other two involved his trust in God, his Father, and all alike concerned the question of how this King and Son is to realize his kingdom. He

---

[1]Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," page 204.
[2]Mark i. 12, 13.

feels that his choice has vaster issues than simply a good man's fight for personal integrity. He, the King and Son, is about to set up the kingdom. He will not build it on bread nor on show, and he will not make any alliance with evil. He will not seek ascendancy over men by an appeal to the senses nor by concessions to sin. The ends of his kingdom are spiritual; and the means to reach them must be the same, however slow the progress or full of pain and terror the path to final success. In his temptation the fate of this kingdom hangs in the balance. His choice of the good is the pledge of its final triumph. His person and its destiny are identical in his mind. "The kingdom of God is in the mind of Jesus essentially bound up with himself."[1]

3. That Jesus is conscious of the supreme significance of his Person is shown in the way he called men to be his disciples and the conditions on which he based such discipleship. "Follow me," he said, "and I will make you fishers of men" for the kingdom. He saw in "the twelve" the founders of the new Israel. Relation to his Person is to fix a man's place in that kingdom. They were to be called before governors and kings for his sake; and he assures them that "Every one therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven."[2] So that Jesus con-

---

[1]Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," page 213.

[2]Matthew x. 32.

ceives of himself as having for the souls of men such a supreme significance as to determine the matter of final destiny. Only one who feels that he sustains a unique relation to God, to human history, to God's kingdom, and a supreme relation to the souls of men could so speak without insanity. Add to this the words of Matthew: "And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me."[1] "There is nothing theological in the attitude of Jesus here, no filling of a rôle, whether it be the Messianic or another; but there is the revelation of a consciousness to which history presents no parallel. Consider how great this Man is who declares that the final destiny of men depends on whether or not they are loyal to him and who demands absolute loyalty, though it involve the sacrifice of the tenderest affections or the surrender of life in the most ignominious death. There are things too wonderful for invention or imagination, things which could never have been conceived unless they were true; and, not to speak of the witness of the Spirit or their historical authentication, the sayings of Jesus that we have just been considering belong to this class of things. We should accept them, were it for nothing else, because of the incredible way in which they transcend all imaginable words of common men."[2]

4. Notice has already been taken of that tone of

---

[1]Matthew x. 38.

[2]Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," pages 237, 240.

authority with which Jesus spoke on matters of duty and destiny and how he dared to interpret and amplify the Mosaic law. Again and again in the Sermon on the Mount he reviews the old laws and customs and adds, "But I say unto you." No prophet of the Old Testament spoke with that tone, and no writer in the New imitates it. It is peculiar to Jesus and reveals his legislative consciousness, which is all the more remarkable in one who indorsed the Old Testament and who drew from it and drank of it as Jesus did. He saw himself as that perfect revelation of which the Old was the preparation and in which the Old was fulfilled. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill."[1] This is the same Person we met in the baptism, who feels that all the issues of the kingdom meet in the hour of his temptation, who lays down in words no human lips are entitled to utter the conditions of discipleship and assumes without arrogance or excitement the awful functions of Lawgiver and Judge. How solemnly the office of lawgiver passes into that of judge is seen in the closing words of the Sermon, where he says: "Every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand."[2] The Speaker speaks as no man ever spoke before, because he knows that the Speaker and the Judge are one.

---

[1]Matthew v. 17. [2]Matthew vii. 26.

These words of the Sermon bring us as close to Jesus as history can take us. They lie behind the first and third Gospels. They rest on the oldest of gospel material; and here, as elsewhere, the New Testament attitude toward Jesus is justified by the witness Jesus bears to himself.[1]

5. When Jesus declares, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will [willeth to] reveal him,"[2] he says things which make him absolutely incomprehensible except on the ground that he is what he is conscious of being. He feels that he is in such a relation to the Father that he has received from him life and truth and power in a manner and measure that are not limited, as all mortal life and knowledge are. The Son stands out just as single and solitary as the Father. There is but one Son in his consciousness, as there is but one Father; and this correspondence of Father and Son in the mind of Jesus justifies his followers in looking on him as the Son of God in a solitary sense. He declares that he alone knows God in that Father-knowledge of him which brings blessedness and life and that all men are dependent on him and his gracious will for that knowledge.[3] How could words more completely justify the atti-

[1] Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," page 253.
[2] Matthew xi. 27.
[3] Alexander, "Son of Man," page 273.

tude of faith toward Jesus than these words in their revelation of his consciousness?

6. Not only do the New Testament writers declare that the life of Jesus was without sin or fault,[1] but Jesus himself asserts as much for himself.[2] He says that he always does the things that please his Heavenly Father and that, therefore, he has unbroken fellowship with him. There are many indirect evidences which are conclusive indications that Jesus was absolutely without the consciousness of moral fault. There never appears in him the slightest trace of any feeling of penitence or of regret for what he has said or done. No prayer for forgiveness ever crosses his lips. He never gives expression to the consciousness of enjoying for the first time peace with God or of coming into harmony with God. He knows nothing else but to be the Son of his Heavenly Father and is always conscious of his Father's love and approval, while all others must first become sons, and even then they must pray for the forgiveness of sins. He sets himself over against the whole race of sinful men as their Redeemer and ultimately as their Judge.[3]

"These are facts," says Weiss, "which no criticism can shake. They speak for themselves. He who has removed from the eyes of all the blindness

---

[1] 1 Peter ii. 22, iii. 18; 2 Corinthians v. 21; Hebrews iv. 15; John viii. 46.

[2] John viii. 29.

[3] Alexander, "Son of Man," page 269.

of self-deception and of self-righteousness, who has taught us all to seek forgiveness where it is to be found, he was either the chief of sinners (for self-righteous pride is the root and climax of sin), or he was the only sinless one."

7. In no one of his miracles does Jesus reveal more clearly the inmost secret of his self-knowledge than in the healing of the paralytic.[1] "When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." Here Jesus indorses a faith which has himself for its object and rewards it with the exercise of a prerogative which can belong to God alone. Jesus does not simply declare the man sinless any more than he simply declares him well.[2] He forgives him and then heals him. Dr. Denny clearly shows the failure of criticism to reduce this passage to a mere statement "that man has power on earth to forgive sins." A slip by Mark in translating from an Aramaic document is assumed to have taken place, inserting the term "Son of man" where it did not belong. But even if this were true, it could hardly have marred the entire apostolic tradition, nor could a miracle by one man serve as proof that any man can forgive sins. Man, generically, can no more forgive sins than man, generically, can heal the lame. It is Jesus, the Son of Man, who makes the palsied whole as evi-

---

[1]Mark ii. 1-12.

[2]Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," pages 307, 308.

dence that he can also lift the paralysis of sin from the soul. This is precisely the vocation of the Son of Man in establishing the kingdom of God, which is a kingdom of grace and of truth, forgiving all their iniquities and healing all their diseases. Such self-knowledge is solitary in the psychology of the race. He challenges the scribes and Pharisees to convict him of sin; he calls his Father to witness that his inmost thought and outer act are always well-pleasing in his sight; he asserts authority to heal all disease and to forgive all sin on the simple condition of faith in himself; and he does this with a spirit and manner that convinces all men that he is "meek and lowly in heart."[1]

8. No study of the inner life of Jesus could be complete without an examination of the term "the Son of man," which is found so often on his lips, especially when he speaks of his vocation and his relation to the kingdom of God. This title is never used in the Gospels on any lips but those of Jesus and in the English translation always occurs as "*the* Son of man." It was such a title as could not be used as a party cry in a Messianic controversy, and there is no point in the criticism that it could not occur on the lips of Jesus until after the confession at Cæsarea Philippi. It is enough like the expression "Son of man," which occurs repeatedly in the books of Ezekiel, Daniel, and elsewhere, to

[1] Matthew xi. 29.

suit the purpose of Jesus to use a term which would reveal more and more to the growing vision of faith without becoming a firebrand to useless political controversies.

The title no doubt goes back to Daniel vii. 13. Out of the restless sea of humanity, blown upon by the four winds of blind natural forces, there arise, one after another, kingdoms and civilizations—lion, leopard, bear, and the unnamed beast. All are brute forces of human nature, each devoured in turn by that which follows. But out of the heavens, not up from the sea, comes one like the Son of Man, "and there was given dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away."

The earthly kingdoms, the fairest and best, are brutal and founded upon force; but this kingdom is given to One who brings in the reign of humanity and promises that the human shall prevail over the brute. This title furnishes Jesus with the very term he needs. The term occurs "in every strata of the evangelic records which criticism has learned to distinguish. It is found in Mark, in the non-Markan source common to Matthew and Luke, in passages peculiar to Matthew and Luke, respectively, and in John."[1] In his own consciousness Jesus is the Son of man, because his kingdom is a kingdom of hu-

[1]Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," page 286.

manity, filling out the ideals of Isaiah ix. 6, 7, xi. 1-9, Micah iv. 1-7, and elsewhere in the prophets and Psalms. He is the Son of man because of the "stock whence he springs—man, humanity, mankind; the Son of man is no man's Son."[1] It expresses his solitude and preëminence. He has no fellow. He is not a son of man, but "*the* Son of man." With the lowliness is the implication of a transcendent personality which cannot share with another his relation to the human race. The final triumph of the human over the brutal in the coming of the kingdom is his own triumph. In such passages as Matthew xxiv. 27, 37, 39, 44 and Luke xvii. 24, 26, 30, xii. 40 Jesus speaks of himself as the Person in whom the glorious vision of Daniel vii. 13*f* is to be finally fulfilled. "Nothing marks off his consciousness of himself more distinctly from every form of prophetic consciousness than this, that, whereas the prophets looked forward to the coming of another, what Jesus saw as the final and glorious consummation of God's purposes was his own coming again"[2] as the Son of man in glory.

9. A study of the self-knowledge of Jesus reveals the fact that he was acutely conscious (more and more clearly revealing it toward the close of his career) that he was to be the Redeemer of the race by

---

[1]Fairbairn, "Place of Christ in Modern Theology," page 364.
[2]Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," page 297.

dying for it and that this giving of himself would mean a ransom for many.[1]

The conviction of Jesus that in filling his divine vocation he is to meet suffering and death is hardly to be called a matter of consciousness. Jesus, indeed, conceives that the Messianic calling involves the death and resurrection of the Messiah, and he sets his face resolutely toward that baptism wherewith he is to be baptized. Again and again during the last months of his life does he tell his disciples that the Son of Man must die and after three days rise again. "This kingdom is not what you think," he says. "The Son of Man must suffer many things, be rejected and put to death." All this is plainly seen to be in the thought of Jesus, more and more clearly revealed toward the end of his life; but it is in the nature of prophetic insight into God's plan rather than that self-knowledge which makes consciousness. But when he begins to show that his death will have a vital and transcendent relation to every man and to the whole race, we find again the marks of that unique consciousness which sets Jesus apart from all men. The whole incident of the confession at Cæsarea Philippi betrays this element in his thought. His death bulks in his own thought just as large as in the thought of the primitive Church. "The kingdom is dependent upon the King and in some divinely necessary way upon a King who dies for it. This is the mind of the primitive Church, the character-

[1]Mark viii. 27-33, ix. 31, x. 33-45.

istic attitude of Christian faith, but it is also the mind of Jesus."[1]

10. There is one phase of the self-revelation of Jesus that is not limited to any one incident or word, but rather strikes us as we view his character as a whole. He escapes those limitations that arise from time and place. He belongs neither to the century in which he lived nor to the land where he was born. The race has neither left him behind as it traveled, nor has he been found out of date in the march of progress. He does not belong to the dead languages nor to the dead peoples, but always with the living, and always does he show himself alive by many infallible proofs. He is universal and timeless. Goldwin Smith says: "There are many peculiarities arising out of personal and historical circumstances which are incident to the best human characters and which would prevent any one of them from being universal or final as a type. But the type set up in the Gospels as the Christian type seems to have escaped all these peculiarities and to stand out in unapproached purity as well as in unapproached perfection of moral excellence. . . . If that type of character was constructed by human intellect, we must at least bear in mind that it was constructed at the confluence of three races—the Jewish, the Greek, and the Roman—each of which had strong national peculiarities of its own. A single touch, a single taint of any of these peculiarities,

[1]Denny, "Jesus and the Gospel," page 331.

and the character would have been national, not universal; transient, not eternal. It might have been the highest character in history, but it would have been disqualified for being the ideal. Supposing it to have been human, whether it were the real effort of a man to attain moral excellence or a moral imagination of the writers of the Gospels, the chances surely were infinite against its escaping any tincture of the fanaticism, formalism, and exclusiveness of the Jews, of the political pride of the Roman, and of the intellectual pride of the Greek. Yet it escaped them all. It is the essence of man's moral nature, clothed with a personality so vivid and intense as to excite through all ages the most intense affection, yet divested of all those peculiar characteristics, the accidentals of time and place, by which human personalities are marked."[1]

The character of Jesus has been before the world for nineteen hundred years. This portrait remains the masterpiece without a rival. He is first in the sense of having no second. Dr. Deissmann says: "Jesus stands out as the One and Paul as the first after the One; or, to speak more like Paul himself, as the first in the One."[2] Renan says: "The memory of Him has been like the perfume of another

---

[1]Quoted by Bishop Candler in "Christus Auctor," pages 47, 48.

[2]Deissmann, "Paulus," page 1. "Aus erscheint Jesus als der Eine, und Paulus als der Erste nach dem Eine, oder paulinischer gesprochen als der Erste in dem Eine."

world, and all history is incomprehensible without Him." "In Him is condensed all that is good and exalted in our nature." To which Strauss adds: "In every respect Jesus stands in the first line of those who have developed the ideal of humanity." John Stuart Mill says: "When this preëminent Genius is combined with the qualities of probably the greatest moral reformer and martyr to that mission who ever existed upon the earth, religion cannot be said to have made a bad choice in pitching upon this Man as the ideal representative and guide of humanity; nor even now would it be easy for an unbeliever to find a better translation of the rule of virtue than to endeavor so to live that Christ would approve our life." Lecky says: "It was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character which through all the changes of eighteen centuries has inspired the hearts of men with an impassioned love; has shown itself capable of acting on all nations, ages, temperaments, and conditions; has not only been the highest pattern of virtue, but the strongest incentive to its practice; and has exercised so deep an influence that it may be truly said that the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists."[1]

[1]Quoted from Renan, Strauss, Lecky, and John Stuart Mill in "Christus Auctor" (Bishop Candler), Chapter IV., on "Has God Appeared among Men?"

With an unaffected majesty and an unstudied spiritual grace this Jesus walks along the awful elevations of a divine perfection. His way leads him through poverty and scorn, agony and death; but he never slips nor falters, he never falls below his sublime claims. In the odd moments and off-hand relations, as well as in the dramatic crises of his life, always he bears himself in the same way—it is the one consistent Jesus. This is the character of Jesus as presented in the Gospels. The portrait is not drawn by description. There are no efforts to eulogize. There is no string of epithets. There is not the slightest trace of dramatic art or of literary skill. The character is allowed to act for himself, think for himself, speak for himself, and make his own impression. He stands sharply drawn, easily recognized in all the documents, with no one like him, having his own unmistakable touch and tone, and speaking in each circumstance and situation words that are not only appropriate to his character, but words to which there is nothing else in the Gospels that bears the least resemblance.

Is this picture real or imaginary? To say that I can feel the reality of it may be satisfactory to me and the highest kind of evidence, but to a man who says that he cannot so feel I must have something else to say. There is little need to argue that the character of Jesus as presented in the Gospels is divine. His immediate followers so read him. He assumes everywhere the divine attitude toward them

and demands of them the correspondent human attitude toward himself. But is it a real character?

If this character of Jesus is not real, it must be either a literary creation, or it must be mythical, or it must be legendary.

Few believe now that this portrait is a literary creation. To say this would be to say that an obscure Palestinian Jew could create a character that has no parallel in history or literature and cause to flow from his lips the world's greatest wisdom and to issue from his life its greatest moral inspirations. It is to say that this fictitious hero of a religious drama stepped off the stage into the arena of history and has swayed the world for nineteen hundred years as neither Cæsar nor Napoleon has ever done. But this assumption is involved in vastly more difficult implications. There is not one Gospel, but four; there are not four Christs, but one. Four such writers must be supposed, and, indeed, four writers who did not collaborate to form this character. The still unsolved synoptic problem is proof that these four Gospels were not written in collaboration. The divergences are too serious and unstudied. Nor could four men working independently of each other ever have produced this character consistent and the same in speech, action, claim, and consciousness through all the Gospel records. The more the documents are subdivided, the more impossible becomes the theory of a literary creation.

Is it mythical? Myths are born under the sway of

the morning star in the twilight hour of a civilization. They belong to the infancy of a race or nation and precede its written history and even its trustworthy tradition. They are not completed at once, but grow under the touch of poetic fancy as vagrant as the winds, without local habitation. Claiming no literary parentage, they are dateless and carry no credentials. They belong to the race among which they originate and reflect its characteristics. Isis and Osiris are Egyptian in every essence; and the same can be said of the myths of the Hindus, Greeks, Scandinavians, and Orientals. They are exaggerations of men or animals, personifications of the forces of nature, and are the answer of the religious and poetic faculties to the questions of primitive philosophy. Hence they are fantastic, grotesque, and often monstrous.[1]

How different from all this sounds the story of Jesus of Nazareth! The divine mystery of his birth results not in any dehumanized or abnormal curiosity, but in a divine Child whose whole childhood is thrown into a few sentences of chaste and reserved speech.[2] Augustus is emperor at Rome. Cyrenius is governor in Syria. Herod is king in Judea. His parents live in Nazareth, but he is born at Bethlehem at the time of the great census. The towns in

---

[1]Bishop Haygood, "Man of Galilee," chapter on "Jesus and Myths." See also article on "Mythology" in any good encyclopedia.

[2]Luke ii. 42-52.

which he preached, the localities he visited, the wells from which he drank, the houses where he stopped, the names of his converts, the political and theological parties of the day, and many other circumstantial details are easily woven into the story, and not one of them has ever been historically discredited. The story moves in deep seriousness and culminates in the passion of the cross and the glory of the resurrection. The whole is suffused with moral passion, and the spiritual motive dominates all. The character of Jesus is everywhere sustained as the Son of man, intensely human, yet not mere man. Indefinable such a character truly is and as full of mystery as it is of majesty, but it is undeniably drawn in the Gospels. This is not mythology, and no attempt to make it so deserves serious consideration.

Is the Jesus of the New Testament a legend? Did the memory of a real Jesus, Prophet, and Master become embellished by legendary additions until it resulted in the Jesus of the New Testament? Are the stories of his divine origin, transcendent claims, miraculous works, mysterious death, and reported resurrection but examples of the legend-making activity of the early disciples?

The Jesus of the New Testament is the Jesus of the Church. This Jesus makes transcendent demands on human faith and conscience. His very presence in the world forbids the philosophy of naturalism, and there is no room in the world of naturalism for such a being as Jesus. When the nat-

uralist refuses to reconstruct his world so as to take Jesus in, naturally he seeks to reconstruct the New Testament so as to leave him out. It is neither critical nor historical nor scientific to study the New Testament with the assumption that the supernatural is the sure sign of the legend and cannot belong to the real history. With this bias as a beginning, a critical operation is brought to bear on the documents of the early Church, and sections and chapters are mutilated or amputated on grounds that pretend to be critical, but are really prejudicial.

The question is simply this: Are the Gospels a mere collection of legends springing up in that twilight zone between the death of Jesus and the beginning of historical Christianity? Is the Jesus they present a legendary character? The naturalistic critics say, "Yes"; and they undertake to gather from the literary wreckage the "actual history" and to reconstruct the "real Jesus." But the "actual history" will not stay settled, and the so-called "real Jesus" cannot get himself believed in by more than one critic at a time.

But let us look the question fairly in the face. Is Christianity founded on legends, Palestinian, Gilgamesch, or any other sort? To this it may be answered:

1. There is not a trace of documentary or monumental evidence to discredit the Gospel records. There is a line of external evidence running back through the Church fathers that establishes the Gos-

pels in the faith of the Church as authentic and reliable records of our Lord's life and of the origins of Christianity. This chain of evidence has never been broken.[1]

2. The early dates which are now being given by the greatest scholars to the New Testament writings leave an extremely narrow margin for a so-called twilight zone where legends might find room to rise and spread. They must rise, and they must spread. People must not only believe them, but they must believe that they have been believed from the beginning. When we see practically all the Pauline epistles given back to him by a criticism which in the words of Harnack "is in a movement backward toward tradition"; when we hear the same brilliant scholar say, "In the years 30-70 and, indeed, in Palestine, more exactly in Jerusalem, everything really came into being and happened, of which what followed was simply the unfolding"; when the tradition-forming period is over and the writings of Gospel history begins not later than 65-70 A.D., we find that the time is too short for his followers to forget who and what he was and to come to believe that he was the transcendent and divine Person of the Gospel records and to believe that they have believed this from the beginning. There is no trace of a clash between the memory of a so-called "real" or "pre-Christian" Jesus and the Christ of Gospel

---

[1]See preceding chapter.

faith, and multitudes of those who had seen and known him were still alive when Luke began to sift the stories of his life and Paul to write letters to the early Church.

3. Paul we know, and his letters are with us to this day. The Christ of the Epistles is the Christ of the Gospels. The one is historical and witnesses that the other is real. Paul was instructed by the immediate followers of our Lord. He covered the very ground where the passion and resurrection took place. He was in close reach of all the facts. The call he heard was a call to suffer great things, and yet he turns from his brilliant and promising place as a leader of the Pharisees and becomes the persecuted apostle of the despised faith. Here is a man of brilliant mind, finished education, and intense convictions. He smashes the plans of a lifetime to get his feet on reality. He follows the truth as he sees it—to Rome and to the block. Where is the room for the myth-makers and legend-mongers when such a man as Paul shakes hands with Simon, who stood in the empty tomb?

4. How did mere legends come to form the New Testament, and how did a book so formed come to sway the world? How did the secret of writing such literature become one of the lost arts, so that the Church has never produced anything in the least like it from that day to this? How did stray legends come to form the face of Jesus, that Form divine, that Character consistent, sustained, transcend-

ent, which is the greatest miracle recorded in the Gospels and which any man can see for himself if he will but read and understand what he reads? "All attempts to resolve him into a myth, a legend, an air—and hundreds of such attempts have been made—have drifted over the enduring reality of his character and left not a rack behind. The result of all criticism, the final verdict of enlightened common sense, is that Christ is historical. He is such a Person as men could not have imagined if they would and would not have imagined if they could. He is neither Greek myth nor Hebrew legend. The artist capable of fashioning him did not exist, nor could he have found the materials. A nonexistent Christianity did not spring out of the air and create a Christ. A real Christ appeared in the world and created Christianity."[1]

---

[1]Van Dyke, "Gospel for an Age of Doubt," page 59.

CHAPTER VI.

The Witness of the Empty Tomb.

BELIEF in the physical resurrection of Jesus was not a late aftergrowth in the Christian Church. Faith in the risen Lord was the foundation of Christianity, and it was this faith which created the Church. No one can seriously doubt that the apostles themselves believed in the reality of the resurrection. Baur, Strauss, and Renan held this to be unassailable and sought to account for this faith on some rationalistic basis. In the words of Strauss, "The apostles firmly believed that Jesus had arisen."

Faith in the resurrection is the base line that runs through the entire New Testament. There are six explicit accounts of it by five different authors and over one hundred references to it. It is everywhere viewed in the same light. It is the foundation of the faith, the basis of doctrinal teaching, the subject of apostolic testimony, and the ground of the believer's hope. It is thus expounded or referred to in the Gospels, the Acts, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Timothy, Hebrews, 1 Peter, and Revelation.

This base line binds together the four great divisions of the New Testament, the Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles, and Revelation, just as the Messianic thread binds into one the three divisions of the Old Testament. The fact is no sooner believed than it is enmeshed in history and interwoven in correspondence. No better evidence of its historical character could possibly be conceived. If it had first been heard of some generations after its supposed date, it might be called a "late aftergrowth." But this faith goes to making history at once; and the primitive Church is ready with a historical book written in the lifetime of Christ's contemporaries, which takes the thread of Christian history from the death of Judas to the planting of the gospel in Rome. The literature of the Church is enriched in the same generation with a wealth of correspondence which glows with faith in the risen Lord. It is easily seen from this that not merely do these divisions of the New Testament support the resurrection, but the resurrection faith binds them into a unity in which each finds support and strength.

The apostles held their apostleship as a call to bear witness to the resurrection. A successor to Judas must be chosen, that he might "be a witness with us of His resurrection."[1] Peter says with transforming passion in his Pentecostal sermon: "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses."[2] On

---

[1]Acts i. 21, 22. [2]Acts ii. 32.

Mars Hill Paul preaches "Jesus and the resurrection;[1] and he bases his whole apostolic doctrine on this as he says: "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain."[2] He says again: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."[3] The sacrifice of all things is counted as nothing, that he may know Christ and the power of his resurrection.[4]

Not only is there direct testimony to the resurrection, but there is also indirect evidence of a striking and convincing character and circumstantial evidence of the strongest kind to corroborate and illumine all the rest.

I. The direct testimony rests on the authority of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul. Matthew tells us that as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week Mary Magdalene and the other Mary (the mother of James) came to see the sepulcher and found the stone rolled away and sitting on it an angel whose face was like lightning and whose raiment was as white as snow. They were told by the angel that Jesus had risen and were charged to go at once and announce to the disciples that the Master would wait for them in Galilee. As they went to carry this message Jesus met them, saying,

---

[1]Acts xvii. 18. [2]1 Corinthians xv. 14. [3]Romans x. 9.
[4]Philippians iii. 8-10.

"All hail," suffered them to worship him and take hold of his feet, and repeated the charge about the Galilean meeting place. Matthew completes his account by telling how the guards reported to the chief priests that the tomb was empty and how the soldiers were bribed to say, "His disciples came by night and stole him away while we slept."

The second Gospel is really Peter's Gospel, from whom Mark is said to have received his information. Mark tells us that Mary Magdalene, Mary (the mother of James), and Salome came with anointing spices, reaching the tomb after the sun had risen and the Sabbath had passed. As they drew near they were saying, "Who shall roll away the stone for us?" and, looking up, they saw that the stone, exceeding great in size, was rolled back. Sitting on it was a young man arrayed in white, who said: "Be not amazed: ye seek Jesus. . . . He is risen; he is not here. . . . Go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee." In trembling and astonishment they fled from the tomb, speaking to no one as they went, for they were afraid. With this statement the Gospel of Mark is supposed to come to an abrupt close. The American Revised Bible says in a footnote: "The two oldest Greek manuscripts and some other authorities omit from verse nine to the end." Hastings's "Bible Dictionary" says: "The probability, therefore, is that these last twelve verses did not belong to the original form of the Gospel." So, then, either the original Mark

had a conclusion which gave a fuller account of the resurrection, or else it did not suit the writer's purpose to make more than a brief reference to the great event that was filling all the thought and faith of the Christian community.[1]

Luke gives in his Gospel a full account of the resurrection; and in his second book, the Acts, he alludes to it seventeen times. Luke's importance as a witness and reliability as a historian has been brilliantly advocated in late years by Prof. W. M. Ramsay, who was once a disciple of the Tübingen school. Luke's authorship of the third Gospel and of the Acts has likewise been advocated on the continent by Professor Harnack, and thus once again one of the "settled results" of criticism has been reviewed in the light of new facts.

"The Acts of the Apostles in the multiplicity and variety of its details probably affords greater means of testing its general character for truth than any other ancient narrative in existence; and, in my mind, it satisfies the tests fully."[2] This is the book with seventeen references to Christ's resurrection, the book in which the apostolate becomes conscious of itself and feels that its mission is to bear witness to the resurrection, and the book whose preachers all

---

[1]Hastings, "Bible Dictionary," Volume III., article on "Mark's Gospel." See also Dr. Alexander's discussion in "Son of Man," page 339.

[2]Lightfoot on "Galatians." Quoted by Dr. Alexander in "Son of Man."

preach "Jesus and the resurrection." This is the writer who gave us the third Gospel and whose histories are written in the true historical spirit. "As far as can be tested, he is correct in fixing the dates, stating the facts, and collocating the events of contemporary history."[1] That he is a careful and conscientious writer is sufficiently shown in his preface, which has been admired by scholars of all schools and ages. In a dignified and straightforward manner he sets forth his reasons for writing, his sources of information, and his method of sifting and shaping his material. He does not claim to have been an eyewitness, but to have gotten his material from those who were the original eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word. He declares that he commits his record to writing, that in the midst of many oral and written accounts his friend and disciple, Theophilus, might have certain knowledge of gospel truth. He says that he had been careful *to trace the course of things*—to trace the course of things *from the first,* to trace the course of *all* things from the first, to trace the course of all things *accurately* from the first.[2] Luke is a trained writer with the instincts of the historian, and his writings have been in a marked degree "verifiable and verified by many and minute tests." He bears direct testimony to the resurrection in the latter part of his Gospel. He says that on the first day of the week at early

---

[1]Alexander, "Son of Man," page 333. [2]*Ibid.*, pages 28, 29.

dawn Mary Magdalene, Mary (the mother of James), Joanna, and the other women came to the tomb and found the stone rolled away. Entering in, they found, not the body of Jesus, but two men in dazzling apparel, who stood by them and said, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen," etc.[1] Returning from the tomb, they told these things to the eleven and the rest. Luke further records that Jesus appeared in person to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus and later to the eleven in Jerusalem and to them that were with them. It is seen that Luke omits other appearances known to us from the other Gospels. It cannot be argued from this that he was ignorant of them; for he tells us in the Acts that Jesus "showed himself alive after his passion by many proofs, appearing unto them by the space of forty days."[2]

John tells us that Mary Magdalene came on the the first day of the week while it was yet dark and found that the stone had been taken away from the tomb. She runs and finds Peter and John and announces: "They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and we know not where they laid him." Peter and John then find for themselves that the tomb is empty, but as yet know not the scripture, that he must rise again. Mary, still lingering, sees two angels in white sitting one at the head and the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain.

---

[1]Luke xxiv. 5-7. [2]Acts i. 3.

They say to her, "Woman, why weepest thou?" and she repeats what she had said to Peter and John. Then Jesus appeared to her, calling her by name and sending her to tell the disciples; and she went, saying: "I have seen the Lord." Jesus then appeared that evening to the disciples as they sat behind closed doors with Thomas absent. After eight days they were gathered again behind closed doors with Thomas present; and Jesus appeared, saying to Thomas: "Reach hither thy finger and thy hand." Then to the seven by the Sea of Galilee he came and said to Simon three times: "Lovest thou me?" John concludes by saying: "Many other signs did Jesus therefore in the presence of the disciples which are not written in this book."

We come now to the remaining witness, Paul, whose testimony is critical and convincing. Pauline Christianity is historical—the larger part of his writings were not denied him even by Baur—and no one has yet been able to drive a wedge between the Christianity of Paul and the Christianity of the Gospels. Paul gives the following summary of our Lord's appearances in 1 Corinthians xv. 3-8: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures: and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve. After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part re-

main unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time." Here Paul assures us that Jesus had been seen alive after his crucifixion by above five hundred believers and that most of these original eyewitnesses were alive at the time of his writing and could be questioned if his readers were so disposed. Paul himself came into immediate contact with immediate disciples of our Lord, notably Simon Peter and James, the Lord's brother.

In verse eight Paul claims to have seen the Lord with his own eyes in such a real and literal fashion that it constituted the last of our Lord's appearances and is thus to be sharply distinguished from the mere visions that came to him afterwards.[1] In 1 Corinthians ix. 1 he lays this experience by the side of John's or Peter's testimony and claims that he had the same basis for his apostleship as they had, for he too had seen the Lord. It was the fact that he had seen the Lord that changed the cruel and conscientious bigot and the self-righteous Pharisee into the passionate lover of Jesus and the untiring apostle of the righteousness which is by faith and of the love that never faileth. Every outlook in life, every inducement of fortune, and every quality of mind and heart impelled him to reject the new faith until he became convinced that beneath it was

[1] Acts xviii. 9.

the bedrock of reality. This reality was to him the resurrection of Jesus from the dead.

Lord Lyttelton considered that "the conversion and apostleship of St. Paul alone, duly considered, was of itself a demonstration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation." We are told in "The Fundamentals"[1] how Lord Lyttelton came to write his masterly treatise on "The Conversion of St. Paul": "The eighteenth century was the darkest period religiously in the history of England since the time of the Reformation. It was the age of the great deists, agnostics, rationalists, and unbelievers, when 'all men of rank are [were] thought to be infidels.' Like so many of the literary men of his time, George Lyttelton and his friend, Gilbert West, were led at first to reject the Christian religion. On the Sabbath forenoon before he died, in an interview with Dr. Johnson, Lyttelton said: 'When I first set out in the world, I had friends who endeavored to shake my belief in the Christian religion. I saw difficulties which staggered me,' etc. In his biography of Lord Lyttelton Dr. Johnson adds: 'He had, in the pride of juvenile confidence, with the help of corrupt conversation, entertained doubts of the truth of Christianity.' His intimacy with Bolingbroke, Chesterfield, Pope, and others of the same kind had no doubt influenced him in this direction. Rev. T. T. Biddolph tells us that both

[1] "The Fundamentals," Volume V., page 107.

Lyttelton and West, men of acknowledged talents, had imbibed the principles of infidelity. . . . Fully persuaded that the Bible was an imposture, they were determined to expose the cheat. Lord Lyttelton chose the conversion of Paul and Mr. West the resurrection of Christ for the subject of hostile criticism. Both sat down to their respective tasks full of prejudice, but the result of their separate attempts was that they were both converted by their efforts to overthrow the truth of Christianity. They came together, not as they expected, to exult over an imposture exposed to ridicule, but to lament over their own folly and to felicitate each other on their joint conviction that the Bible was the word of God. Their able inquiries have furnished two of the most valuable treatises in favor of revelation, one entitled 'Observations on the Conversion of St. Paul' and the other 'Observations on the Resurrection of Christ.' "

Four of these witnesses—Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—relate stories of the resurrection which are more or less parallel and can, therefore, be compared. A close study of these four accounts of what took place at the tomb on that memorable first day of the week will furnish some interesting results, which may be summarized in the following table:

A TABLE OF THE RESURRECTION ACCOUNTS.

	Persons.	Time.	Events.	Appearances or Objects Seen.	Sayings.
Matthew.	Mary Magdalene and the other Mary.	As it began to dawn.	Great earthquake; stone rolled away by an angel.	(*a*) An angel. (*b*) Jesus, saying: "All hail!" They took hold of his feet and worshiped.	(*a*) Angel says: "Fear not. He is risen. Go tell his disciples." (*b*) Jesus says: "All hail! Go tell my brethren."
Mark.	Mary Magdalene, Mary (the mother of James), Salome.	When the sun was risen.	Stone rolled away.	Young man in white.	Young man says: "He is risen. Go tell his disciples and Peter."
Luke.	(*a*) Mary Magdalene, Mary (the mother of James), Joanna, and the other women. (*b*) Peter.	(*a*) At early dawn. (*b*) After report of the women.	Stone rolled away.	(*a*) Two men in dazzling apparel seen by women. (*b*) Linen cloths lying in empty tomb, seen by Peter.	Two men say to women: "He is not here. Remember how he said, The Son of man must be crucified and rise again."
John.	(*a*) Mary Magdalene. (*b*) Peter and John. (*c*) Mary Magdalene.	(*a*) While it was yet dark. (*b*) After report of Mary. (*c*) After Peter and John had gone.	Stone taken away.	(*a*) Open tomb seen by Mary. (*b*) Napkin and cloth in tomb lying apart, seen by Peter and John. (*c*) Two angels and Jesus seen by Mary.	(*a*) Two angels say to Mary: "Woman, why weepest thou?" (*b*) Jesus says to Mary: "Why weepest thou? . . . Mary." (*c*) "Touch me not. Go tell my brethren"

It will be seen from this table that there are minor differences on practically every point except that the stone was rolled away and that the tomb was empty. John mentions Mary Magdalene. Matthew says Mary Magdalene and the other Mary. Mark has Mary Magdalene, Mary (the mother of James), and Salome. Luke mentions Mary Magdalene, Mary (the mother of James), Joanna, and the other women. Thus are mentioned one woman, two women, three women, and three with an indefinite "the other women" in the respective narratives. As to time, John says, "While it was yet dark"; Matthew, "As it began to dawn"; Luke, "At early dawn"; while Mark says, "When the sun was risen." As to events in the natural realm, Matthew says that there was "a great earthquake, and an angel rolled the stone away"; while the other three simply say that "the stone was rolled away," or words to that effect. Matthew says that an angel was seen; John says that two angels were seen; Mark simply says that a young man in white appeared and spoke to the women; while Luke says that two men in dazzling apparel were seen. The recorded sayings of the angel or angels do not differ much, except that some are longer than others. The message is the same: "He is not here; he is risen. Go, tell his disciples." We note that Jesus says to Mary, "Touch me not," in John; while Matthew says that the two Marys "took hold of his feet and worshiped him."

Such a survey demonstrates that we have here

four separate and independent accounts. Such narratives could neither have been manufactured in collusion nor could they have been derived from one another. The differences are too marked and too many, and they lie on the surface. The harmony is at the heart and must be studied out. Had the stories been manufactured in collusion, the harmony would be on the surface, and the discrepancies would come out under the cross-examination. The harmony and the differences are precisely such as would be expected when four separate and independent witnesses report on one and the same stupendous event.

Such stories could not have been fabricated independently of one another. The agreements are too numerous and fundamental. Separate and independent forgers reciting what never occurred could never have attained the fundamental harmony of events, atmosphere, and emotion that pervades these narratives. Even more apparent is the truth that four confederates in literary crime did not and could not have fabricated these stories in collusion with one another. They would never have left all over the face of the narrative such differences as we cannot in our present knowledge (or ignorance) fully reconcile. Such differences are the assets rather than the liabilities of our faith, and we should thank God for them. They testify to the unstudied truthfulness of the writers. They are such as fuller knowledge would clear away, and this fuller knowledge the early Church doubtless possessed; and so

these accounts were put side by side with not so much as the slightest attempt to explain away the discrepancies. The oral tradition must have been so prevalent and so ample that no one of the writers felt called on to make a complete table of what took place on that first Easter morning. What was said would be read in the light of what was left unsaid and its special purpose be understood. John explicitly tells us that the Christian community knew vastly more of the events of Christ's life, death, and resurrection than any one (or all) of the Gospels has preserved in writing. John records Jesus as saying to Mary, "Touch me not," when he must have known that Matthew had said: "They took hold of his feet and worshiped him." John, the eyewitness, with full knowledge of all these things and with the other Gospels doubtless finished and in his hands when he wrote, is unconscious that any problem has been made for faith.

The careful reader will not fail to note how these accounts are given in a straightforward and artless manner. Events that are supernatural are told with a simplicity and a naturalness that belong to eyewitnesses of the truth. There is no setting of a stage as in the drama, no coloring of the picture as in fiction, no eulogies or exclamations of wonder, no mysticism of the religious fanatic, no vision as of the spiritual genius. All breathes the sober air of fact and the manner of eyewitnesses telling the truth.

II. There is a very impressive indirect testimony

that arises from a study of certain words, phrases, and details incidentally used.

1. Jesus is reported to have appeared to his followers only; never to Pilate nor to Herod nor to the Sanhedrin. The reason does not appear on the surface. It seems at first glance to discount the Gospel that no enemy or disbeliever had this conclusive evidence thrust upon him. Surely no forger would willingly risk such an embarrassment to a manufactured narrative. But so it happened, and the witnesses tell it simply because it is the truth. The same may be said about the statements that Jesus was not at first recognized by his disciples. The fact is told simply because it is true. The reason is left to be inferred.

2. John reports that Jesus said to Mary: "Touch me not." We cannot be sure that we know to this day why he said this. What possible motive could there be to put such a remark in the record unless it belonged to the true event? But this is what Jesus said, what Mary heard, what Mary reported, and, therefore, John writes it down.

3. The appearances of Jesus are occasional and startling. He is no more the old familiar Master on whose bosom John leaned and with whom they walked and supped. Jesus must have had his reason for this; and the disciples may or may not have realized it, but they record it so because it happened so. It is hardly what one would have expected and not at all like what a forger would have fabricated.

4. Another instance is found in John xx. 3-5: "Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulcher. So they ran both together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulcher. And he stooping down, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying." How much this is like what we know of these two men! John is younger and outruns the other. Reverent and thoughtful, he stoops and looks in without entering the solemn place. Peter, the older, runs more slowly; but, once arriving at the tomb, his bold heart pushes him on to the impulsive act. He enters the tomb and looks around. John then follows, and both become convinced that the tomb is empty. Similar to this is the story told in John xxi. 7, where the Lord is seen on the shore. John is quick to perceive that it is the Lord, but it is Peter who is quick to act. "He girt his fisher's coat unto him, (for he was naked,) and did cast himself into the sea."

5. Singularly beautiful and convincing is the passage in Mark xvi. 7: "But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter, that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him." Peter had denied his Lord, and his own conscience would cut him out of any message sent simply to the disciples. How true to Peter's need, to the whole Gospel story, to the whole character of our Lord is this single phrase bending beneath its weight of love not only for heartbroken Peter, but for penitent backsliders of all ages! Another character scene is the way Jesus

convinces his unbelieving disciple Thomas. This is found in John xx. 26-29: "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." These stories are artlessly told, are perfectly characteristic, and should convince any one of the truthfulness of the narrative.

5. But the most unapproachable in beauty and simplicity is the scene in the garden where Mary, weeping, asks the gardener where he has laid the body of the Lord. She has seen Jesus and has heard him speak, but she still mistakes him for the gardener. He says just one word, the word and the tone he used when he led her from the thralldom of the seven devils into the life of love. Her eyes were opened in an instant, and she fell at his feet and cried, "Rabboni" ("my Master"). Is this reality or fiction? This is Jesus; this is Mary; this is life.

6. Take once more the passage in John xx. 7. John and Peter see "the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself." Why the writer

should take such pains over this small and seemingly irrelevant detail has puzzled many. He makes no attempt to explain; he simply relates what he saw with his own eyes. But may it not be, after all, exceedingly relevant and significant of the Master's manner? This narrow house has been his tomb. The breath of God has swept "through the sleeping and silent clay." It is an awful moment and sublime to him and all the race. He will not leave his tomb in haste nor lose that majestic calm which he carried through all his life. What grave robbers would have dealt thus with the napkin and cloth, and what fiction writer would have thought or cared to put this in? But an eyewitness would carry every aspect of that empty tomb stamped on his mind forever and could not fail to tell just what he had seen.

III. Circumstantial evidence is that indirect and presumptive evidence that arises from the study of the proved or admitted facts in a case. Three main lines of circumstantial evidence combine to prove that Jesus rose from the dead.

1. The first line of argument arises from the very existence of the Christian Church itself. It is evident from the epistles of St. Paul that shortly after the crucifixion the little band of disciples was marvelously augmented and that an "institution which we call the Church thus rises at once fair and strong out of the grave of Jesus."[1] The foundation of this

[1]Bishop Candler, "Christus Auctor," page 92.

Church was the belief that Jesus had risen from the grave and ascended to the right hand of God the Father. No one can question that this was, from the beginning, the faith of primitive Christianity. The Church built on this faith had become in the time of Tacitus at Rome "a vast multitude"; and a little later Pliny the Younger says to the Emperor Trajan: "The contagion of this superstition has not merely pervaded the cities, but also all villages and country places." The Churches which burdened Paul with their daily care had become in the time of Tacitus a great host and, a generation later, an embarrassment to imperial paganism. Every one of them was built on the same foundation stone, the resurrection of Jesus.

Even if the Gospel memoirs were written as late as the Tübingen critics claimed, it would not follow that the resurrection story was "a late aftergrowth"; for it would still be true that it was belief in the resurrection which created the Church and constituted everywhere its normative principle. A late date for the Gospels would only argue that the belief was late in taking literary form. The existence of the Church itself under the leadership of the apostles, with its councils, controversies, and missionary activities, is prime evidence that the faith was prior to the institution it created and to the memoirs which preserve it for the world. The moral wonder and glory of this early Church and its mighty rush through the Greek and Roman world have been the

marvel of the historian in every age. The rationalist who rejects its supernatural foundation feels called upon to explain its resistless sweep and its lifting power over the lives of men.

The moral power and spiritual fascination which it possessed may have been due, as Gibbon said, to the zeal of the early Christians, to their doctrine of a future life, to the miraculous power ascribed to the primitive Church, to the pure and austere morals of the first Christians, or to the union and discipline of the Christian republic; but these are themselves effects and constitute the credentials of that faith in the risen Lord which could so suddenly and so lastingly call them forth.

The argument is essentially the same when Lecky seeks to explain the success of Christianity by its elements of power and attraction combined in it, by its freedom from local ties, by its strong appeal to the affections, by its pure and noble system of ethics, by its doctrines of the brotherhood of man and of the supreme sanctity of love, and by the congruity of its teachings with the spiritual nature of mankind. These things may go far toward explaining the success of Christianity, but they leave Christianity itself unaccounted for. It is not the success of the early Church that makes the point of this argument; but the existence of the Church itself, founded on faith in the resurrection and full of faith, good works, compassion, purity, zeal, and an unworldliness that "mocked the cross and flame."

Such a Church, feeling itself firmly founded on an event which had only recently taken place and with the greater part of the original eyewitnesses still alive, furnishes us with circumstantial evidence of the highest validity.

2. The second line of argument arises from the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath. The Jewish Sabbath was an ancient and highly honored institution. The early Church was composed of Jews, all of whom exceedingly revered the moral law of Moses and most of whom followed the ceremonial law as well. Yet we find in the Acts that this early Church assembled on the first day of the week, and the earliest Christian writings convey the same information. With no council called to decree it and no emperor to enforce it, led by the logic of its life, the Church observes as its day of rest the first day of the week. Something took place on that day that constituted a new Sabbath for the Christian community, for on that day God rested again from his work of the new creation. The apostles tell us that this was the day on which Jesus rose from the dead, and this is the only reasonable explanation that has ever been offered or can be offered for this change.

3. It is impossible to ignore the transformation that took place in the character of the apostles shortly after the crucifixion. When Jesus was buried, the little band of disciples was completely stunned. The chief priests seemed to have feared his resur-

rection, but there is not the slightest evidence that the disciples had hoped for it. When Peter and John had convinced themselves that the tomb was empty, they did not on that account conclude that he had risen, "for as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead." It was after this that Jesus joined the two on the way to Emmaus and, as yet unknown to them, said: "What communications are these that ye have one with another, as ye walk? And they stood still, looking sad." This is after the tomb had been found vacant and after the angels had declared that Jesus had risen. They are still foolish and slow of heart to believe, not knowing the Scriptures. Jesus first opens to them the Scripture and shows them the atoning death and resurrection glory of Christ in the Word before he makes himself known. He opened the heart to believe before he challenged the eye to see. There must be a fitness to receive the evidence of the resurrection, and it was the prepared heart that caught the sign in the breaking of the bread.

The grief of the women was disconsolate to the point of distraction. The men had come to the complete destruction of their hopes and bankruptcy of their faith. With them all love alone was left—love utterly loyal, though the lights of faith had gone out, and the song of hope had been hushed. Only love was left, and love was only a tomb in which hope had forever gone to sleep. The belief that Jesus had risen from the dead swept through

that defeated company like the breath of God swept through the silent and sleeping Body in Joseph's tomb. The enthusiasm with which they bore witness to the resurrection, the zeal with which they walked in the new "way," the power to reproduce in their lives the qualities of their Master, the Christ passion that took possession of them, the fortitude with which they endured danger and persecution for his sake, and the well-nigh irresistible testimony which convinced thousands of others — all this enabled them to found a "new order, a new society of men, with new moral principles, new moral energies, new moral character, and a new moral influence, which from that beginning went on till it revolutionized the thought, the theology, and the moral conditions of the Roman Empire and of the world."[1]

This transformation in the disciples themselves is a fact of supreme importance as circumstantial evidence. It establishes beyond question the fact that the disciples themselves believed with absolute certainty that Jesus had risen, and this became the consuming conviction of their lives. The question now arises as to what is the reasonable explanation of this faith. The resurrection of Jesus completely satisfies the facts in the case, and nothing else will. The resurrection is indeed above reason and supernatural, but every other proposed explanation of the facts is unnatural and unreasonable. The fact of

---

[1] Alexander, "Son of Man," page 347.

the resurrection is the only reasonable explanation; and it is the explanation given by the disciples themselves, whose character and conduct commend their testimony. The testimony and circumstantial evidence combined make such a demonstration as no man can doubt, except on the basis of *a priori* prejudice against the event in question. To argue the evidence is to admit the fact. To reject the fact is in effect to say that no amount of evidence can establish such an event, which is really to say, "I would not believe it if I saw it with my own eyes"; and this is to reject the evidence of the senses, the very basis of modern philosophy. Reason cuts its own throat when it refuses to consider reasonably the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus from the dead.

How pitiful and paltry seem all the efforts of skepticism to satisfy the facts in the case and leave the miracle out! To say that Jesus did not really die but only swooned, was thought to be dead and afterwards revived, is to say that the divine Victim passed through the ordeal of Gethsemane, the trial with its scourging, the hours on the Roman cross, the stroke of the spear and a swoon that deceived the expert executioners, and, after all this, had life enough left in his body to survive entombment in a sealed tomb and strength enough to escape, though a great stone barred the door. Once escaped from the tomb, he would be in a pitiable plight, unable to plant an immortal hope in his followers or to inspire them with a more than mortal courage. He himself

would know the resurrection tale to be a farce, and no one can conceive of the Jesus of the Gospels being a party to such a fraud nor of the apostolic faith being founded on such a farce.

Renan attempted to satisfy the facts in the case by assuming that the so-called miracle originated with Mary. He says, "The passion of a hallucinated woman gives to the world a resurrected God" —that is, Mary was in love with Jesus, and in the ecstasy of her lovelorn grief her overwrought nerves and fevered brain conceived hallucinations to be bodily appearances. But it is only necessary to add that it is as easy to believe that Jesus rose from the dead as to believe that Christianity originated from such a source. Furthermore, it is difficult enough to believe that Mary persuaded such men as Matthew, Thomas, and later Saul that she had seen the risen Lord; but it is impossible to believe that she persuaded these and the other apostles and the five hundred to believe that they too had seen the Lord.

Not radically different from this is the theory of Strauss that the appearances of Jesus were merely visionary, a theory which has proved popular with some because it does not implicate the disciples in conscious fraud. The visions were realistic, but not real; the disciples were sincere, but mistaken. To this it has been well replied: "Where was the *prepossession* or the *fixed idea* or the *state of expectancy*

that would give rise to such visions?"[1] Such an occurrence would violate all the probabilities of known psychological science.

One can say without hesitation that even if it were possible to believe that one disciple in the midst of his gloom might have seen this vision like a sunburst over his night, it would still be impossible to conceive how not only one but several, not only women but men as well, not separately but in groups and in congregations, by night and by day, in closed rooms and "in the open," should have seen the same vision at the same time and lose the vision just as simultaneously as they had acquired it.

It is logically possible to believe that one religious freak or fanatic or genius might dream out a scheme of religion and fill it in with alleged facts, appearances, etc.; but it is absolutely impossible to believe that this multitude of witnesses should happen to or agree to create by visions this risen Lord who perfectly completes on a divine and supernatural scale the Christ life of the Gospels and should give us "this same Jesus," though in new and unthought-of relations, with the world-wide passion in his heart, the world-wide commission on his lips, ascending in glory to glory and leaving behind him a Church small and weak, but conscious that the gates of hell could not prevail against it. This is to substitute five hundred impossible miracles for

---

[1]Bishop Candler, "Christus Auctor," page 86.

the one miracle, transcendent indeed, but reasonable in such a life plan as the gospel and with such a person as Jesus.

As Dr. Bruce says: "All naturalistic attempts to explain away the resurrection up to this date have turned out failures. The physical resurrection remains."[1]

---

[1] "Apologetics." Quoted by Dr. Alexander in "Son of Man."

CHAPTER VII.

The Bible the Hope of the World.

THE Bible is by all odds the foremost book in the world. Whether it is considered divine or human, it must be acknowledged to be supreme among earthly books. Sixty-six pamphlets, separated in time over a period of a thousand years or more, written by some forty or more different writers, and touching the chief nations of ancient history, come together into an inseparable and imperishable volume. The learning of the world did not give it birth. The power of earth did not protect it. Yet, in spite of scorn from the one and persecution from the other, these writings have been preserved, copied, translated, and spread abroad to the uttermost parts of the earth.

Philosophers and sages, poets and orators, historians and moralists have not received such homage. The correctness of its text is certified to by a multitude of manuscripts so great, so old, and so well authenticated as to put the Bible in a class by itself among ancient books. Some important classical works can claim only one manuscript known to be still in existence; for the others ten or fifteen is thought to be a large number, and but few of these date back earlier than the tenth century of our era. "The manuscripts of whole or parts of the New

Testament are already reckoned by thousands, the oldest of which go back to the fourth and fifth centuries, and parts are still older."

No book has ever been so widely translated. The first three centuries saw the Bible translated into Latin, Syriac, and Coptic. The next three centuries gave the Word to the Gothic, Armenian, Georgian, Libyan, and Ethiopic languages. About 600 A.D. the Bible was known in eight languages, and in each of them several attempts at translating had been made. In the next period the spread of Christianity is witnessed by the fact that the Bible was translated, at least in part, into the Arabic and Slavonic from the Greek and into the German, Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and French from the Latin. But it is from the thirteenth century on that the work of building the great vernacular Bibles began on a larger scale.

Now the Bible can be read in all the civilized languages of the world, and there is "hardly a language among uncivilized tribes of any importance into which this marvelous Book has not been rendered." The total number of versions is about five hundred. It makes itself at home in every language, and each native feels that it talks in his own tongue and to his own heart. Wherever it has gone its pages have been the pathways of progress, and its leaves have been for the healing of the nations.

Seldom, if ever, has the Bible been put for the first time into the native speech and into the hands of the common people of any nation that it has not

made a new era in its language and life and set all its commerce, politics, art, literature, and morals to the music of an ascending scale.

Every year fifteen million copies of the Scriptures, in whole or in part, are scattered to the four corners of the earth. The nineteenth century, in giving many other marvelous gifts to man, gave three hundred and sixteen million volumes of the Bible.

Its pictures have been painted, its heroes chiseled, its songs set to music, its language quoted, its incidents recited, so that one might say that the flood tides of literature, art, and oratory have left Scripture marks upon all the walls of time. Tennyson is said to refer to Biblical subjects three hundred times; Longfellow, even more; Shakespeare has over five hundred allusions to the Bible; and Bacon shows its influence in almost every essay.

Let us trace the influence of this Book on civilization and see if it is not, indeed, the hope of the world. Consider the failure of ancient paganism. What a world of weltering chaos was that Greek and Roman society into which the Word of God came!

The triple crown of civilization is the same in all ages — religion, government, the family. Where these three no longer abide, dissolution and despair, like birds of doom, croak over all the doors of a nation's hope. This triple crown was lying in the dust of the Forum, trampled by the hasty feet of the tyrant, the skeptic, and the libertine. The old religion was a spent force. The easy-going Roman

conscience found a place in the Pantheon for all the gods of earth, and to the sophisticated and self-sufficient Roman spirit they were all alike bereft of faith and full of fraud. Religion of some sort is the vital breath without which the body of morality soon becomes a putrefying corpse. Dissoluteness flooded society, and the foundations of social purity and moral wholeness were almost universally removed. Occidental desire met the refinements of Oriental vice on the banks of the Tiber. The luxury of a world's wealth was at their disposal, and the license of unbridled passion and power allured them. There sprang from the loins of ancient Rome a monstrous progeny. St. Paul gives one flashlight photograph in his great first chapter of Romans.

Man was degraded below the level of the brute and claimed an altitude above that of the angels. The same age that saw Nero a monster hailed him as a god. For Gibbon says the Roman emperor was "at once priest, atheist, and god."

The Roman populace lusted for the thrill of war which they no longer had the hardihood to endure for themselves; and so the arena is made a miniature battle field, and the ecstasies of the dying hour are relished by the boys and girls and men and women of Rome.

The home did not survive the downfall of religion. Marriage fell into such disuse that the emperors in vain set a premium upon matrimony to induce a dissolute society to observe some conventional

decency. The marriage bond became a rope of sand in rotten Rome. Religion had no power to restrain, society no standards strong enough to check.

In such a world childhood had little chance. Infanticide and the exposure of infants was not a clandestine crime to hide a secret sin, but a common and recognized practice. Only under Christian teaching has the child had its rightful place in the midst of affection and tender solicitude.

A world in which the body is the only reality, in which the soul, God, and immortality are ignored, will never and can never make a noble and illustrious womanhood; but just the creature the woman of paganism has always been — stupid, ignorant, enslaved, dupe or decoy, as the case may be, of man, but never his equal and inspiration. In that dark world immorality did not bar a woman from social position. Some of those who were most attractive and sought after were notoriously immoral. "Aspasia bore a sullied name, as did Sappho, Lais, Cleopatra, Agrippina, and many others. That class of women, who with us are excluded from society, were not only flattered and sought after, but seem to have been recruited from those who were the most attractive for their intellectual gifts as well as for physical beauty. No woman, if bright, witty, and beautiful, was avoided because she was immoral."

The woman who aspired to fame for her cultivated gifts and who sought to shine in the banquets

of society and who was capacitated to do so by superior intellectual and social charms advertised herself as belonging to what we consider the excluded class. Society in Rome meant men and this class of women. The entrance of women into society for its uplift is a Christian achievement.

Paganism adorned and educated its women for purposes of evil; Christianity, to make them conspicuous for superior usefulness and bright with beautiful ministries. Virtuous womanhood in Rome was left dull, stupid, ignorant, and inferior to men. At last religion, family, and government go down in ruin together.

To the truthfulness of this picture bear witness the poets and writers of the day. Horace and Juvenal agree with Seneca, who says: "All things are full of iniquity and vice. More crime is committed than can be remedied by restraint. We struggle in a contest of criminality. Daily the passion for sin is greater; the shame in committing it is less. Wickedness is no longer committed in secret; it flaunts before our eyes. Innocence is not rare, but nonexistent."

Such was the failure of ancient paganism; such the world into which the religion of the Bible came. Without the assistance of a divine revelation the human mind can never climb higher than the Athenian intellect. Human character, by innate tendency and heroic effort without God, will never show loftier courage, tougher fiber, finer self-control, more

instinctive integrity than the older Romans. All that taste, intellect, grace and beauty, valor and honor ("of the earth, earthy") could accomplish had been done. The fairest civilization the world had ever seen was crumbling. The strongest stock mother earth had ever bred was degenerate and all but dead. The world was without a hope or a future.

> "Ere she gain her heavenly best,
> A God must mingle in the game."

This was the fullness of time for God to complete his revelation of salvation by grace through faith in the Person of his Son. Such was the world into which the religion of the Bible came.

The new religion was a life, but the fountain of its life was its Holy Scripture. It was in this sense a religion of a Book. To those who understand it this Book was its "rock of defense"; to others it was its rock of offense and stone of stumbling. Against this Book, as we have already seen, persecution beat in most malignant fury. The possession of one or more of these sacred rolls was spiritually an exalted privilege, but politically it was a deadly peril. To read these Scriptures in public or private exposed the reader to the death penalty. Deacon Euplus, of Catania, in Sicily, was apprehended by the sheriff in the act of reading the Gospel. He carried the roll with him to the judge, read from it aloud at his trial, and declared that it was better to die than to surrender his Bible. From it he had

drawn his highest inspirations, and to it he gave his last and highest proofs of devotion. Sometimes a gathering of men and women were arrested while reading the Bible and the whole company carried away to torture. Primitive Christianity was a Bible-loving religion; and primitive Christians expressed their loyalty to the Saviour, whom they had not seen, by devotion to his Word, which they had seen. The faith soon appears in all parts of the empire, and everywhere it appears the same in its outstanding features. The Christ passion is the unfailing sign and essential quality of Christian experience, and the Scriptures were always and everywhere its source and inspiration. Wherever the religion prevailed the Bible became the rule of life, and its heavenly ideals began at once to bear holy fruit. There sprang up in Cæsar's household saints and in Cæsar's kingdom a Christian society where purity of morals, piety of heart, and charity of life adorned the lives of those who had been devotees of licentiousness, avarice, and greed. Marriage became a hallowed institution presided over by the Lord himself, whose presence at the feast turns the waters of earthly love into the pure wine of heavenly devotion, which is always best at the last.

Charity, not unknown before, took on new meaning, and brotherhood was born among men who recognized themselves as children of the same Father. A heathen writer jeered at their love for one another and said: "Their Master has persuaded

them that they are all brothers." Woman was exalted to equality with man, and the home became the chief glory and peculiar creation of the religion of the Bible. The gladiatorial shows passed away before the spread of the Scriptural conception of man as a being of infinite dignity and immortal worth. The heathen looked on in amazement at institutions springing up of which paganism had never dreamed —institutions for the care of the poor, the orphan, the aged, the helpless, the fallen, and the leper. As Lecky says: "It has covered the globe with countless institutions of mercy absolutely unknown to the whole pagan world."

The Christian party became the aggressive and life-giving force in that senescent realm of the Cæsars. By the time the scepter fell from their enfeebled grasp the Church had solidarity enough and a bishop with genius enough to become the guardians of the sacred lamps of history. Leo became the real ruler and was the providential man who was the "hiding place" when Goth, Hun, and Vandal respected more this voice of the Church than the legions that had once filled the earth. So it was the Church that held the falling empire together until the new Europe was providentially prepared to receive the fertilizing fragments where they fell. Like Joshua, she stayed the twilight of civilization until events had shaped themselves to make the night of the Dark Ages endurable, blown through with winds of promise of a coming day.

The result was that civilization did not die, though it suffered an eclipse. The missionary from Rome was busy in that midnight hour, carrying the light as he went, kindling the fires that were to make all Europe blaze with Christian truth. We have talked much of Christianity saving old Rome, but saving new Europe was vastly more important.

This period of Volkerwanderungen, as the Germans call the migrations of the nations, was a dark and bitter stretch of years. But even here the bow is in the cloud. Nowhere is the hand of God more evident or the influence of the Bible more plainly seen than in the history of the Ostrogoths under their celebrated king, Theodoric. The pagan vandals came to pillage and left behind them a tradition of plunder that gave the word "vandalism" to the world. "But the noble tribe of the Ostrogoths, under their celebrated leader, Theodoric, called Dietrich von Bern in the German songs, tried another plan. They adopted Roman civilization as far as possible and endeavored to combine both nations under one dominion."[1] The Roman noble, Cassiodorus, the most celebrated scholar of the time, was his Secretary of State. The reports and letters of this man are still extant and show how, in addition to his Roman law training, he was influenced by Christianity and the reading of the Bible. Later in

---

[1]Von Dobschütz, "Influence of the Bible on Civilization," page 48.

his life he founded a monastery and, entering it himself, devoted his life to the study of God's Word.

But long before this the Bible had begun its influence among the Ostrogoths. Ulfilas (310-380) was bishop of the Goths for forty years and gave to them his famous Gothic Bible. "Ulfilas not only did the work of translation probably of the entire Bible, but he invented an alphabet for it, using as a basis the Greek uncial alphabet, with preservation of its orders, as well as the numerical and phonetic value of the letters. He adapted it to its purpose by the use of forms taken from the Latin and the Runic alphabet, creating a system better for the purpose than either of the three."[1] The Church gave to the Goths the noble Bishop Ulfilas and his monumental Gothic Bible. Centuries go by, and the bread cast upon the waters comes back. The Goths were Arians; but the Bible had been planted in their life, and its influence is seen in the character of their great leader and in their attitude toward the old civilization and the Christian religion. Some of the Goths had sacked Rome, it is true; but it was the pagan patricians and not the Christians, the palaces and not the Churches, that felt their fury. But for Ulfilas and his Bible, Theodoric might have been an unchecked Attila and the course of history very different.

The influence of the Bible can be seen not only in

---

[1] "Universal Cyclopedia," article on "Gothic Language."

broad outline at this era, but in smaller details. Theodosius ordered the Bible placed in the court rooms for use in taking the oath, and the worn condition of the first chapter of John's Gospel in many extant manuscripts shows frequent use for that purpose.[1]

The influence of the Bible can be seen again in the laws on Sabbath observance. Constantine had ordered that no courts should sit on Sunday. Theodosius had enacted stricter laws, and Justinian made Sunday a legal holiday.

One wonders how the missionary strategy of the Church kept itself so clear through all these political and social cataclysms until he remembers that it was the influence of the Bible that kept the Church Christian, fired the monks with zeal as they read it in their cells, and filled their hearts with visions of the "regions beyond." At mass they would hear the gospel read. "Every one that hath left houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive a hundredfold [here], and shall inherit eternal life [hereafter]." They would hear this with ascetic ears and go forth to seek some far-distant and desert place. Thus the Iro-Scottish and Anglo-Saxon monks were filled with missionary zeal. Thus Willibrord and Boniface crossed the North Sea and preached among the

---

[1]Von Dobschütz, "Influence of the Bible on Civilization," page 31.

Frisians and Saxons. Beneath Ireland is Patrick; beneath England is Augustine; beneath Germany is Boniface; beneath Scandinavia is Ansgar.

In all these centuries the Bible was not denied to the laity; but under repeated shocks the old civilization was crumbling and its light growing dimmer, until at last the night of ignorance settled down. The very form of the old Roman Empire ceased to be. Few were left who could read at all, even among the clergy, especially in Gaul; and many a rich monastery had not even a copy of the Bible in its possession. Before the coming of this night the Bible was supreme in the Catholic Church and had no rival in her affections. She emerges from the age of scholasticism with the Apocrypha a part of the canon, the voice of tradition supreme over the Scripture, and the Bible denied to the laity.

The long night began to break with the coming of Charlemagne, well named the Great, who esteemed the Bible the great textbook for his people. He brought Alcuin from England to revise the text of the Bible and made him abbot of the monastery at Tours, where the scholars gathered to do the work. The influence of the Bible in the civilization which Charlemagne founded can be seen in three main particulars. From the sixth century synods and councils had sought to enforce the obligation of observing Sunday in a more solemn fashion. They did not at first base this duty on the fourth commandment or demand that manual labor cease, but Char-

lemagne bases his law expressly on the Old Testament commandment and commands the strictest observance of the day. The second particular is the law of the tithe. That which was first paid voluntarily by Christians comes at last to be demanded by the priest, and Charlemagne shapes the law of the empire to meet this demand. The farmer must pay his tithe to his parish priest. Charlemagne, in the third place, took Deuteronomy xxiii. 19 as his guide and made the flat prohibition against taking interest a part of the public law.

The Dark Ages pass at last, and history has a new birth. We see an "emergence of nations whose impulse is upward; and Christian civilization begins, full of living, purifying, and ascending forces." Beneath it all is the religion of the Bible, keeping alive the old learning and planting schools and universities in the twilight of the new day.

As the Middle Ages come to a close it is an open Bible that guides Europe to a greater light. Beneath modern England is Wycliffe; beneath modern Germany is Luther; beneath Scotland is Knox; and and shining like a star for all Western Europe is Calvin, and each man with an open Bible in his hand.

What makes our world different from pagan Rome? Not "railroads *versus* Roman highways nor mail trains *versus* messengers, not telegrams *versus* signals nor the printed page *versus* written manuscript nor gattling guns in lieu of battering-rams"; but the spirit of our life, the spiritual ideals

of progress and reform, of government and society. This has come from the Bible in the hands of the missionary and, later on, in the hands of the translator and the expounder. Let the map of the world tell to-day what the open Bible, civil and religious liberty, and evangelical religion, or the lack of it, will do for a people.

No wonder Huxley says of the Bible: "Throughout the history of the Western world the Scriptures, Jewish and Christian, have been the great instigators of revolt against the worst forms of clerical and political despotism. The Bible has been the *Magna Charta* of the poor and of the oppressed.[1] For three centuries this book has been woven into the life of all that is best and noblest in English history. It has become the national epic of Britain, it is written in the noblest and purest English, and abounds in exquisite beauties of mere literary form. By the study of what other book could children be so much humanized and made to feel that each figure in that vast historical procession fills, like themselves, but a momentary space in the interval between two eternities and earns the blessings or the curses of all times according to its efforts to do good and hate evil?"[2]

Modern paganism has shown itself as inadequate

---

[1]Huxley, "Essays upon Controverted Questions," Prologue, pages 52, 53.

[2]Huxley, "Critiques and Addresses," page 61.

to meet the needs of men as the classical religions of the Roman world. Let us take a brief, but I trust not superficial, survey of the non-Christian religions of to-day.

Africa, the ash heap, is answer to the mongrel faiths that hold sway there. Man-stealing and cannibalism do not exhaust the record of her griefs and grievances. I can hear Mr. Hotchkiss saying now, as he spoke at the Macon Laymen's Convention: "There are no graveyards in Africa." The jackal is undertaker and sexton all in one.

India is the answer to Hinduism, with her temple-sheltered obscenity, with her one hundred and twenty-eight million illiterate women,[1] her child marriages (eight million two hundred thousand girls married under the age of fourteen),[2] her child widows, her girl babies (one-third of whom are secretly murdered as soon as born),[3] and eighty-one per cent[4] of her married women preferring suicide to the living immolation of Hindu wifehood—this is answer enough.

China is answer enough to Confucianism and Buddhism—over ninety-nine per cent of her women and ninety per cent of her men illiterate, her girl babies murdered by the tens of thousands[5] every year, her moral and physical filth, her intellectual

---

[1]Dennis, "Christian Missions and Social Progress," Volume I., page 107. [2]*Ibid.*, page 119. [3]*Ibid.*, page 133. [4]*Ibid.*, page 95. [5]*Ibid.*, page 131.

pendulum swinging between deceit and conceit, her fantastic science, her nightmare of medical practice, the prey of pestilence, the victim of flood and famine, haunted by superstitious terror—"awaiting the manifestation of the sons of God."

Japan is losing faith in her ancestral gods, but in her nervous haste to be wise she has not learned to begin in the fear of the Lord; without home life or any word to express it, her womanhood can lose character without losing caste. Her brilliant and brave-hearted people will never find rest till they build their national life on the Bible as the written Word and on Christian experience as the living voice of God.

These religions are without hope for the future. "Hinduism teaches that God is near, but forgets that he is holy. Mohammedanism teaches that God is just, but forgets that he is loving."[1] Buddhism teaches that life is fleeting, but forgets that soul and service endure through all eternity. Confucianism teaches that human relationships are holy, but forgets that the supreme relations are religious and that God is the goal for every soul.

The evils of Christian lands exist in spite of the protest of the religion of the Bible. The evils of heathen lands are imbedded in religious traditions and "derive their most terrible power from the reli-

---

[1]Robert E. Speer, in lecture on "The Non-Christian Religions Inadequate."

gious sanctions by which they are surrounded."[1] Everywhere paganism has taught salvation by works and has effected always a divorce between religion and morals. Christianity teaches salvation by grace through faith and identifies character with piety.

Mohammedanism has found or made a desert wherein it has gone, and Dr. Cochran declares that he has not found a single pure-hearted or pure-lived adult man among the Mohammedans of Persia.[2] Buddhism is a sterile and paralyzing faith. No Buddhist nation ever set up a patent office or ever wrought a great achievement. Some Hindu languages have no word for "chaste" as applied to men. The contribution of Buddhism to society is a paralyzed personality; the contribution of Confucianism to society is an impoverished personality; the contribution of Hinduism to society is a degraded personality; the contribution of Mohammedanism to society is an enslaved personality.[3] Such religions cannot meet the intellectual, social, and moral needs of men. They have no conception of a holy God, no fixed standards of morality, no adequate sanctions of character.

The religious future of the race is wrapped up, not in them, but in the religion of the Bible. It

---

[1]Robert E. Speer, lecture on "Non-Christian Religions Inadequate." [2]*Ibid.*

[3]Dennis, "Christian Missions and Social Progress," Volume I., pages 382-391.

wins the same victories in heathen lands to-day that it did in Rome and Corinth. A cruel and murderous Zulu chief becomes in the second generation a preacher and in the third a college president. I heard this college president speak at the World's Sunday School Convention at Washington, D. C., in 1910.

The Fiji Islands turn from cannibalism to become a self-supporting Christian Church, sending out missionaries to the islands about them.[1] India has written a new Acts of the Apostles. China, under the stimulus of the Christian religion, is seeking in one great fourfold movement to modernize her education, emancipate her women, constitutionalize her government, and throttle her opium trade.

"Christianity brings new energies, new ideals, and new hopes. Its historic record in all ages reveals a wonderful and subtle power to develop unexpected, even unsuspected, capacities in individual men and to crystallize character in society. It can do what nothing else can accomplish: it can make alive. It possesses the power of moral change and the secret of a quickened conscience. It can renew and transform the man."[2]

"Let us not forget that Christianity, like its Master and Lord, is 'chiefest among ten thousand' and that the holy seed planted in heathen soil must bring

---

[1]Dennis, "Christian Missions and Social Progress," Volume I., page 415. [2]*Ibid.*, page 450.

forth *after its kind* if it is to survive and flourish. God's supremacy can allow of no partnership. His personality cannot be interpreted in terms of pantheism. His spirituality will tolerate no idolatry. His incarnation is once for all consummated in Jesus of Nazareth. His Spirit is alone the only possible source of regenerate life. His atonement can give no place to legalism. His holiness can make no compromise with sin. And Christianity throughout all its essential features can neither acknowledge the coördinate authority nor share the honors of prestige with any other religion. If it is true to itself in this respect, there need be no doubt of its sufficiency. It has wrought with unrivaled mastery in the past. It is still achieving its victories, both at home and abroad, in the present generation. It retains every element of power. It holds every secret of past success. It is still as fully capable of leadership and as able to subsidize and transform for its high purposes all the forces of modern times as it has always been in the past. The wonder, the magic—the divine wisdom, rather—of Christianity is its power of adjusting itself to all human environments and of Christianizing without destroying them. It transcends with its spiritual influence the institutions, laws, and customs of nations and summons to its service literature, science, art, and inventions."[1]

[1]Dennis, "Christian Missions and Social Progress," Volume I., page 463.

The nineteenth century has matched the first in wonders of grace. The twentieth will exceed the second in the victories of the cross. Nations that have "lain among the pots" for thousands of years "shall be like a dove whose wings are covered with silver and whose feathers with pure gold." Christianity has yet the dew of its youth, and the Bible is the hope of the world.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: May 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

BS 480

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 240 552 0